

ON EVIDENTIALITY IN AMERICAN SPANISH AND BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE<sup>1</sup>

Gabriel Martínez Vera  
Newcastle University

**ABSTRACT.** This paper discusses the indirect evidential markers *dizque* in American Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese by focusing on the Spanish varieties of Guayaquil (Ecuador) and Lima (Peru), and the Brazilian Portuguese variety of São Paulo (Brazil). I adopt a comparative approach in which I discuss their syntax, semantics and pragmatics. To thoroughly document their properties in a theoretically driven approach, a comprehensive questionnaire building on previous literature was used, and data from five consultants per variety were gathered—fieldwork practices were followed. The purpose of such an approach is to complement previous studies, which have mainly focused on corpora. As for the syntactic properties, I discuss their distribution in connection to a number of different elements, such as modal and evidential adverbs, among many others; the use as an illocutionary evidential is, in general, disallowed in these varieties. As for the semantic and pragmatic properties, I discuss the types of evidence with which these evidentials are compatible, the at-issue vs. not-at-issue distinction and the doubt implication that sentences with these elements normally have. This study attempts to provide a comprehensive overview of these evidentials in these varieties, so that future research can build on it to single out different properties in controlled (e.g., experimental) settings.

**Keywords:** evidentiality, complementizer, *say*, American Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese

**RESUMEN.** Este artículo examina el marcador evidencial *dizque* en el español de América y en portugués brasileño mediante el estudio de las variedades de español de Guayaquil (Ecuador) y Lima (Perú), y la variedad de portugués brasileño de São Paulo (Brasil). Se adopta un acercamiento comparativo en el cual se tratan la sintaxis, semántica y pragmática de *dizque*. Con el fin de documentar con detalle las propiedades de este elemento en un acercamiento informado por un interés teórico, se construyó un cuestionario exhaustivo sobre la base de la literatura previa, el cual se utilizó para recolectar datos de cinco hablantes de cada variedad—se siguieron prácticas de trabajo de campo. El objetivo de dicho acercamiento radica en complementar estudios previos, lo cuales se han centrado sobre todo en corpus. En cuanto a las propiedades sintácticas, se aborda la distribución de *dizque* en relación con distintos elementos, tales como adverbios modales y evidenciales, entre otros; el uso de *dizque* como evidencial ilocucionario no es posible en general en estas variedades. En cuanto a las propiedades semánticas y pragmáticas, se examinan los tipos de evidencia con los que *dizque* es compatible, la distinción entre elementos en cuestión y elementos fuera de la cuestión, así como la implicación de duda que las oraciones con este elemento suelen incorporar. Este estudio plantea una visión general y amplia de *dizque* en estas variedades con el fin de crear una fuente en la que se puedan basar investigaciones posteriores para concentrarse en propiedades específicas en entornos más controlados (por ejemplo, para estudios experimentales).

**Palabras clave:** evidencialidad, complementante, decir, español americano, portugués brasileño.

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank José Camacho, Liliana Sánchez and Tania Torres Oyarce for discussion of different aspects of this paper. I would also like to thank an anonymous reviewer for detailed and constructive comments. Many thanks as well to Renato Lacerda for helping me out with translations and data collection in Brazilian Portuguese. I am also grateful to my fifteen consultants. All errors remain my own.

## 1. Introduction

This paper discusses the indirect evidential markers *dizque* in American Spanish (AS) and Brazilian Portuguese (BP)—evidentiality is a grammatical category whose core meaning encodes the source of information an individual draws on regarding that piece of information (see Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2004, 2006, 2018; see Izvorski 1997; Van der Auwera & Plungian 1998; Mortelmans 2000; Dendale & Tasmowski 2001; Plungian 2001; Faller 2002, 2012, 2019; Chung 2007; Matthewson et al. 2007; Sauerland & Schenner 2007; Murray 2010, 2014, 2017; Peterson 2010; Schwager 2010; von Fintel & Gilles 2011; Koev 2011, 2017, 2018; Lee 2011; Şener 2011; Smirnova 2013, 2021; AnderBois 2014; McCready 2015; Korotkova 2016, 2017, 2020; Lau & Rooryck 2017; Martínez Vera 2020; Pancheva and Rudin 2019; Bhadra 2020). Sentences with these evidentials are exemplified in (1)-(2) (*dizque* is normally considered an adverbial element). (1)-(2) convey the meaning that the children eat vegetables; in addition, they convey the meaning that the speaker has indirect evidence (frequently, reportative evidence) for this piece information—*dizque* is translated as *they say* in many examples; it is also translated as *supposedly*, *so-called*, and similar expressions when the epistemic meaning of doubt seems more appropriate in that context.

- (1) a. *Dizque* los niños comen verduras. AS  
*dizque* the children eat vegetables  
 b. Los niños *dizque* comen verduras.  
 the children *dizque* eat vegetables  
 ‘The children eat vegetables, they say.’
- (2) a. *Dizque* as crianças comem verduras. BP  
*dizque* the children eat vegetables  
 b. As crianças *dizque* comem verduras.  
 the children *dizque* eat vegetables  
 ‘The children eat vegetables, they say.’

More specifically, this paper focuses on the Spanish varieties of Guayaquil (Ecuador) and Lima (Peru) and on the Brazilian Portuguese variety of São Paulo (Brazil)—these have not been documented (in detail) to the best of my knowledge (Olbertz 2005 documents the use of *dizque* in Salcedo, a small town in the Ecuadorian Highlands, based on corpus data). I adopt a comparative approach in which I discuss the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of these elements by thoroughly documenting their properties. To do so, I prepared a comprehensive theoretically informed questionnaire of sentences with these evidentials building on the previous studies on them, which have mainly focused on AS and, to a lesser extent, on BP (see Kany 1994; Casseb Galvão 2001; Magaña 2005; Olbertz 2005, 2007; López Izquierdo 2006; Travis 2006; Cruschina & Remberger 2008; Babel 2009; Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2013, 2020, 2022; Alcázar 2014, 2018; De la Mora and Maldonado 2015; Grajales 2017; Saito 2019, 2021; Martínez Vera 2020; Sanromán Vilas 2020). Such a questionnaire was solved by and discussed with five consultants per variety (totaling fifteen consultants).

My methodology follows fieldwork practices to document properties in a language in detail by means of discussion with a small number of participants (2 to 6 is common practice) in an approach that is theoretically informed both by previous research on this topic in particular and by previous literature on indirect evidentials more generally. In this regard, this paper contributes with a (to a large extent) novel methodological approach to these evidentials in that the previous literature has mainly focused on corpora and has made limited use of acceptability judgments and elicitation practices (see Matthewson 2004; Bower 2008; Davis et al. 2014; Bochnak & Matthewson 2015 for discussion with regard to the soundness and validity of the

methodology adopted in this paper). My approach has the additional advantage of highly controlling for sociolinguistic factors: all my consultants have very similar backgrounds in terms of age range, schooling, etc. The general motivation for such a comprehensive and focused approach lies in the extensive variation that is found in the literature when different varieties of Spanish are discussed (e.g., Mexican vs. Colombian Spanish) and in the need to, from a theoretical perspective, apply specific tests to address the status of some of the previously discussed properties of these evidentials (e.g., what is the status of the doubt implication in sentences with *dizque*, for instance, is it entailed or not across varieties?).

Based on such a theoretically informed methodology, I discuss the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties of these evidentials in an approach that allows to identify very nuanced distinctions. As for the syntactic properties, a key question lies in what the structural position of these elements is (Cruschina & Remberger 2008; see Demonte & Fernández Soriano 2022 for a recent overview). I suggest that the evidentials in these varieties share properties with modal and evidential adverbs—the use as an illocutionary evidential used to cite somebody else’s words is, in general, disallowed in these varieties. I further discuss the distribution of these evidentials in connection to whether they appear to combine with subclausal constituents (Travis 2006): in the Spanish varieties, this is possible; in Brazilian Portuguese, this is much more limited. As for the semantic and pragmatic properties, I discuss the types of evidence with which these evidentials are compatible, the at-issue vs. not-at-issue distinction and the doubt implication that sentences with these elements normally have (see Demonte & Fernández Soriano 2022; see also Brasoveanu & Farkas 2007; Bary & Maier 2021). It is worth pointing out from the outset that there is variation within and across varieties. This is one of the main contributions of this paper in that it is shown that, synchronically, there is variation within and across dialects—in this sense, this contribution adds more nuanced distinctions to those reported in the previous literature. I believe that the findings of this paper can be the starting point for further studies focusing on specific properties of the evidentials under discussion in controlled (e.g., experimental) settings to address the extant (intra- and interdialectal) variation with regard to the evidentials under consideration.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 0 discusses the methodological approach that is adopted. Section 0 discusses the syntactic properties of the evidentials. Section 0 turns to the semantic and pragmatic properties of *dizque*. Section 0 is the conclusion; suggestions for future research are discussed.

## 2. Materials, participants and methodology

The questionnaire was prepared in written form and consisted of 43 items (each item consisted of 1, 2, or 3 sentences depending on the property at hand), which targeted most of the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties that have been reported in the literature for different varieties of AS and BP. The questionnaire was prepared by the author in Spanish. Many of the examples that were used were gathered from the previous literature; some variations were introduced on many occasions to gather more complete paradigms; if the property under consideration was not (directly) addressed or exemplified, I proposed an item targeting such a property. My colleague Renato Lacerda, a native speaker of BP, translated it into this language, and controlled for some aspects where confusion may have arisen due to differences between AS and BP after consultation with the author. In particular, some word order variations were controlled for, so that they would sound more natural in Brazilian Portuguese, and plural subjects (and contexts targeting plural subjects) were used in most cases to minimize the potential interpretation of *diz* as a verb inflected in the third person singular. In addition, instructions were given indicating that *diz-* in *dizque* should not be confused with the inflected verb; for this reason, as well, *dizque* was written down as a single word (*dizque*),

instead as two separate words (*diz que*), as commonly found in the literature. Throughout this paper, the relevant element in Brazilian Portuguese is written down as *dizque*.

In the following section, I will discuss the actual tests and their implications in detail. In this section, I provide a general grasp of the properties that were targeted in the questionnaire. While on many occasions the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of sentences with these evidentials are intertwined, I would like to separate them in this section for expository purposes, specifically, I adopt a split between syntax, and semantics and pragmatics. With regard to the syntax of these elements, I focused on their distribution targeting the questions raised in (3). The main goal in this regard was to determine in what positions these elements may or may not surface in different kinds of constructions. It is worth pointing out that some of these tests had semantic or pragmatic consequences. For instance, with regard to (3)b, some consultants indicate that sentences addressing this issue are degraded, because the meaning of *dizque* and *possibly* seem to be in conflict to some extent (similar considerations apply to (3)c). In a similar vein, with regard to (3)g, the distribution of these evidentials as parentheticals is key in connection to not-at-issue meaning.

- (3) *Questions targeted by the syntactic tests*
- a. What are the positions in which these elements can surface (e.g., sentence initial position, sentence final position, etc.)?
  - b. What is the distribution of these elements in combination with modal adverbs, e.g., *possibly*, evidential adverbs, e.g., *apparently*, and evaluative adverbs, e.g., *unfortunately*?
  - c. What is the distribution of these elements in combination with modal verbs such as *can* and *must*?
  - d. What is the distribution of these elements in embedded clauses (e.g., *if*-clauses, *when*-clauses, different kinds of *that*-clauses, etc.)?
  - e. What is the distribution of these elements in combination with negative elements such as *no* and *never*?
  - f. What is the distribution of these elements in different types of questions (e.g., *yes/no*-questions, *wh*-questions)?
  - g. What is the distribution of these elements as parentheticals?

With regard to the semantics and pragmatics of these elements, I focused on the issues raised in (4). The purpose here is to identify what kind of elements are these evidentials. Key aspects in this regard are whether these elements can be used as illocutionary evidentials, the at-issue and not-at-issue distinction, and the status of the different meanings that are conveyed by these sentences, i.e., what meaning components are entailed and, if not entailed, what is the status of such meaning components. As in the discussion of the syntactic properties that are targeted, what is dubbed here as semantic and pragmatic may well have syntactic consequences. Thus, while answering (4)a has as an effect in the semantic and pragmatic analysis pursued, such an answer is also relevant to determine the syntactic position of these elements.

- (4) *Questions targeted by the semantic and pragmatic tests*
- a. What kind of evidential are these elements (e.g., illocutionary, epistemic)?
  - b. What meaning components (scope proposition, evidential proposition, doubt implication) are at-issue and not-at-issue?
  - c. What meaning components (scope proposition, evidential proposition, doubt implication) must always be present in sentences with these elements?
  - d. What kinds of evidence are compatible with sentences with these elements?

The data that are discussed in the following sections was gathered by work with fifteen consultants. As indicated, five consultants were from Guayaquil (Ecuador), five consultants were from Lima (Peru), and five consultants were from São Paulo (Brazil). The five consultants from Guayaquil are between 33 and 35 years of age, were born and raised in the city, and hold undergraduate and master's degrees; three out of the five consultants went to the same high school; all the consultants have lived most of their lives in the city. The five consultants from Lima are between 29 and 34 years of age, were raised in the city from an early age (one consultant arrived in Lima at the age of 6; the other ones were raised in the city after birth), and hold undergraduate and master's degrees; they all went to the same university and have lived most of their lives in the city. The five consultants from São Paulo are between 25 and 38 years of age (four of them are in their mid-twenties or early thirties), have lived in the city of São Paulo most of their lives and hold at least an undergraduate degree.

With the Spanish consultants, I held 45-minute-long interviews in which we went through the questionnaire. For each sentence, an acceptability judgment was requested. The consultants could indicate whether the sentence was OK, bad (i.e., ungrammatical) or degraded. If a sentence was degraded, I would further ask whether it was very degraded (i.e., closer to bad) or whether it was a little degraded (i.e., closer to OK). In addition, speakers could make comments about the sentences, and make suggestions as to how to correct them if they found them degraded. They were also encouraged to indicate in what circumstances it would be felicitous to utter the sentences. As for the BP consultants, they were sent the questionnaire via email. They could indicate whether the sentence was OK, bad (i.e., ungrammatical) or degraded, and could add additional comments if a sentence was degraded. They were also encouraged to make additional comments (as in the case with the Spanish consultants), and could contact Renato Lacerda for questions and follow-ups. The differences in methodology did not seem to yield significant differences in the judgments, as will be shown in the discussion of the data—i.e., the variation that was found was to be expected within the limits of what has been discussed for these evidential markers.

### 3. Syntactic distribution

This section discusses the syntactic distribution of the evidentials under discussion. Some of the issues that are discussed are the interaction of these evidentials with quoted material, with epistemic and evidential adverbs, with negation, with questions, among many others. Ultimately, it is shown that the quotative use of *dizque*, whereby the (exact) words from somebody else are reproduced, is, in general, disallowed in the varieties under discussion, i.e., these evidentials cannot be used to report somebody else's words (section 0; see Bary & Maier 2021 for nuanced and recent discussion of quotation). The so-called epistemic use of these evidentials, which is discussed in section 0, appears to be the most attested, which is to be understood in connection to the expression of doubt of an individual (in general, the speaker)—parenthetical uses of *dizque*, which are also discussed, appear to also include an epistemic (i.e., doubt) component (section 0). The labelling function, where an individual expresses an evaluation of, in general, a subclausal constituent, is possible in the Spanish varieties of Guayaquil and Lima, but is more restricted in the BP variety of São Paulo. This function, in addition to cases involving elided material in response to questions, is discussed in section 0. Section 0 summarizes the discussion.

#### 3.1. Quotative uses

The starting point is the quotative use of these evidentials. In what follows, there are three examples targeting quotative uses. Building on the previous literature, I tested a grammatical case as reported in the previous literature for Colombian Spanish—such a case appears in (5)-(6), and involves a dialogue, where A asks B to report somebody else's words. Examples (7)-

(8) and (9)-(12) are uttered against contexts where the speaker is explicitly asked to reproduce the words that they heard—note that declarative ((5)-(6), (9)-(10)), negative imperative<sup>2</sup> ((7)-(8)) and interrogative ((11)-(12)) sentences are tested. Overall, the use of quotative *dizque* was ungrammatical for my consultants in the three varieties. There was one exception in the variety of Guayaquil: one speaker found (5)-(12) either grammatical or just slightly degraded. In addition, one speaker of the variety of Lima found (5)-(12) degraded, but thought that they had heard some examples like these when growing up. A methodological issue that must be mentioned is that my consultants were sometimes inclined to understand the cases with a verb in the third person as reports made using their own words. This is relevant when further testing the quotative use of these evidentials: it must be made rather explicit that somebody else's words are being quoted. To sum up, my survey suggests that *dizque* does not have a quotative use in the varieties under discussion. This test is relevant syntactically in that it suggests that these evidentials would not be located in a speech act projection, but somewhere else, i.e., in a lower position, as will be shown below (see Matthewson et al. 2007 for a comprehensive take on the debate between speech act vs. modal evidentials; see Cruschina & Remberger 2008 for discussion of the left periphery in expressions with *dizque*). Semantically, these cases indicate that *dizque* is not a speech act operator in these varieties (see Faller 2002, 2019; Murray 2017 for an overview). With regard to the notation when reporting judgments, I make use of a \* only when all the consultants judged the sentence to be ungrammatical.

- (5) A: ¿Pero qué te dicen? AS  
           but what CL say  
           ‘But what do they say?’  
 B: *Dizque* uy, Doña Carmen quiere bastante a Jaime.  
       *dizque* miss Carmen loves a lot Jaime  
       ‘Wow, Carmen really loves Jaime.’  
 (Travis 2006: 1279)
- (6) A: Mas o que estão te dizendo? BP  
       but the what is CL saying  
       ‘But what do they say?’  
 B: \**Dizque* ah, a Dona Carmen gosta muito do Jaime.  
       *dizque* the miss Carmen loves a lot of.the Jaime  
       ‘\*Wow, Carmen really loves Jaime, they say.’

*Context:* A couple is having a fight. Person 1 tells Person 2 that Person 2 should not come back until Person 2 solves the problems in which Person 2 is involved. The neighbor overheard (with interest) the fight through the window. A friend asks the speaker what she (literally) heard:

- (7) *Dizque* no vuelvas hasta que soluciones tus problemas. AS  
       *dizque* no come until that solve your problems  
       ‘Don’t come back until you solve your problems, they say.’
- (8) \**Dizque* não volte até que resolva os seus problemas. BP  
       *dizque* no come until that solve the your problems  
       ‘\*Don’t come back until you solve your problems, they say.’

---

<sup>2</sup> Negative imperatives make use of the subjunctive in these languages.

*Context:* A couple is having a fight. Person 1 tells Person 2 that Person 1 is involved in problems with debt. Person 2 asks Person 1 what kind of problems Person 1 is facing. The neighbor overheard (with interest) the fight through the window. She could only hear this brief interaction, because the couple noticed that the neighbor appeared to be eavesdropping. A friend asks the speaker what she (literally) heard:

- (9) *Dizque* estoy metido en deudas con el banco. AS  
*dizque* am stuck in debts with the bank  
 ‘I’m in debt with the bank, they say.’
- (10) \**Dizque* estou envolvido com dívidas no banco. BP  
*dizque* am stuck with debts in the bank  
 ‘\*I’m in debt with the bank, they say.’
- (11) ¿*Dizque* en qué (problemas) andas metido? AS  
*dizque* in what problems go stuck  
 ‘What problems are you stuck with?’
- (12) \**Dizque* com que problemas está envolvido? BP  
*dizque* in what problems are stuck  
 ‘\*What problems are you stuck with?’

### 3.2. Epistemic uses

This section discusses many instances of the so-called epistemic uses of *dizque*, which, very broadly speaking, consists of cases where belief (or knowledge) are relevant to understand the meaning of the evidential (in particular, the epistemic meaning of *dizque* consists of a doubt implication; see section 0). In general, *dizque* appears in its two canonical positions in the examples to follow (according to the literature; see, e.g., Cruschina & Remberger 2008 for seminal work in this regard), i.e., in sentence-initial position and preceding the verb (the latter is regarded as a case involving topicalization of, e.g., the subject). The initial conclusion that can be drawn based on the evidence provided in what follows is that *dizque* would be located in the TP, as a mood adverbial (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022), and moves into the CP area in an evidential projection (Cruschina & Remberger 2008; see also Cinque 1999).<sup>3</sup>

The first examples that are discussed in this section involve declarative sentences with *dizque* in sentence-initial position and preceding the inflected verb (following the subject), as in (13)-(16). Interesting variation is found in this regard. First, let me point out that nine out of my ten Spanish speaking consultants can accept *dizque* both in sentence-initial position and preceding the verb, which is as indicated in the previous literature (i.e., (13) and (15) are grammatical). There is, however, one Peruvian consultant that found the examples with *dizque* preceding the verb degraded (i.e., (13)b and (15)b are degraded; the judgments of this consultant varied to some extent across the items of the questionnaire, but there was a clear preference for the cases of *dizque* in sentence-initial position). Interestingly, such a judgment is more frequent in BP: three out of five of my consultants found the corresponding cases, with *dizque* preceding the verb, degraded (for one of them, they were highly degraded), i.e., (15)b and (16)b are degraded—the cases with *dizque* in sentence-initial position were grammatical.

<sup>3</sup> It would be less clear to make the claim that *dizque* moves into a speech act projection, as Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2022) suggest, at least for the cases under discussion, since there is no evidence that *dizque* is illocutionary in nature. It is true that the evidence may be tied to speech act participants, but this does not mean that this requires an analysis where *dizque* moves into an illocutionary projection (see Martínez Vera 2020 for different ways of dealing with this issue; see also Haegeman & Hill 2013; Bhadra 2018, 2020).

Overall, this suggests that the position of *dizque* is sensitive to the previous discourse, as indicated in the previous literature (see, e.g., Cruschina & Remberger 2008), e.g., to topichood. In addition, there was a difference among Spanish speakers: four out of the five Peruvian speakers preferred (13) and (15) without the expression *no se preocupe* ‘don’t worry (about it)’ as a preamble—such a case has not been reported in the literature to the best of my knowledge.<sup>4</sup> They indicated that such a phrase conflicted with the expression of doubt that *dizque* introduced. This issue will reappear throughout this paper: it reappears when, e.g., discussing sequences of *dizque* and adverbs (such as *possibly*) below in this section, as well as with respect to the question as to what the status of the doubt meaning of *dizque* is, which is discussed in section 0.

- (13) a. *Dizque* el ladrón consiguió escapar. AS  
*dizque* the thief managed to escape  
 b. El ladrón *dizque* consiguió escapar.  
 the thief *dizque* managed to escape  
 ‘The thief managed to escape, they say.’
- (14) a. *Dizque* o ladrão conseguiu escapar. BP  
*dizque* the thief managed to escape  
 b. Os ladrões *dizque* conseguiram escapar.  
 the thieves *dizque* managed to escape  
 ‘The thief/thieves managed to escape.’
- (15) a. No se preocupe: *dizque* la alcaldesa (sí<sup>5</sup>) quiere mejorar el sistema AS  
 no CL worry *dizque* the mayoress yes wants to improve the system  
 educativo.  
 educational  
 b. No se preocupe: la alcaldesa *dizque* quiere mejorar el sistema educativo.  
 no CL worry the mayoress *dizque* wants to improve the system educational  
 ‘Don’t worry (about it): the mayoress wants to improve the education system, they say.’
- (16) a. Não se preocupe: *dizque* a prefeita quer (sim) melhorar o sistema BP  
 no CL worry *dizque* the mayoress wants to yes improve the system  
 educativo.  
 educational  
 b. Não se preocupe: os vereadores *dizque* querem melhorar o sistema educativo.  
 no CL worry the councilors *dizque* wants to improve the system educational  
 ‘Don’t worry (about it): the mayoress/the councilors want/s to improve the education system, they say.’

I will now turn to the discussion of sentences where *dizque* co-occurs with different kinds of adverbs, namely, modal adverbs, as in (17)-(18), evidential adverbs, as in (19)-(20), and evaluative adverbs, as in (21)-(22). Focusing on possibility adverbs first, specifically, on AS *posiblemente* and BP *possivelmente* ‘possibly,’ there is quite some variation; these adverbs are located in the TP. Regarding my consultants from Guayaquil, I found the following: two of

<sup>4</sup> An anonymous reviewer indicates that (15)b might be degraded for some speakers because the introduction *No se preocupe* is not to be expected to be followed by a topic.

<sup>5</sup> The AS element *sí* appears here as an emphatic (see Hernanz 2007), which provides certainty to actually carrying out what the scope proposition indicates. Similar considerations apply to BP *sim* in (16)a.



them found (17) ungrammatical on the grounds of redundancy, i.e., *dizque* and *posiblemente* ‘possibly’ convey the same meaning; two of them preferred the order in (17)b, they found (17)a degraded, and indicated that there is redundancy in both cases; one consultant found (17)a slightly degraded, and (17)b ungrammatical. Regarding my consultants from Lima, I found the following: three of my consultants find both sentences in (17) slightly degraded, indicating that there is redundancy in these cases; one consultant preferred the order in (17)b, this person found (17)a degraded ((17)b was also degraded, but to a lesser extent), and indicated that there is redundancy in both cases; and one consultant found both sentences in (17) ungrammatical. Regarding my consultants from São Paulo, I found the following: my five consultants found (18)a grammatical; three of them found (18)b degraded, whereas the other two found it acceptable. Overall, the application of this test suggests that *dizque* does have an epistemic meaning of possibility, as proposed in the previous literature; there is, however, ample variation that needs additional research. Note, in this regard, that my findings add more subtleties to what has been reported in previous research, for instance, Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2022) indicate that sequences with *dizque* and *posiblemente* ‘possibly’ are possible in both orders, with a preference for *dizque posiblemente*.<sup>6</sup>

- (17) a. No se preocupe: *dizque* posiblemente la alcaldesa (sí) quiere mejorar el AS  
no CL worry *dizque* possibly the mayoress yes wants to improve the  
sistema educativo.  
system educational
- b. No se preocupe: posiblemente *dizque* la alcaldesa (sí) quiere mejorar el  
no CL worry possibly *dizque* the mayoress yes wants to improve the  
sistema educativo.  
system educational  
‘Don’t worry (about it): the mayoress supposedly wants to improve the education  
system, they say.’
- (18) a. Não se preocupe: *dizque* possivelmente a prefeita quer (sim) melhorar BP  
no CL worry *dizque* possibly the mayoress wants to yes improve  
o sistema educativo.  
the system educational
- b. Não se preocupe: possivelmente *dizque* a prefeita quer (sim) melhorar  
no CL worry possibly *dizque* the mayoress wants to yes improve  
o sistema educativo.  
the system educational

The next case that is examined here involves sequences with *dizque* and an evidential adverb, i.e., *aparentemente* ‘apparently’ in AS and BP; these adverbs are located in the CP (lower than evaluative adverbs, but higher than modal adverbs; see Rizzi 1997 for discussion of the left periphery and the projections it may include; see Cruschina & Remberger 2008 for discussion of *dizque* in particular). Overall, the co-occurrence of *dizque* and this adverb is more acceptable than the co-occurrence of *dizque* and *possibly*’s counterparts in these languages, varying from acceptable to degraded (this contrasts with Demonte & Fernández-Soriano’s findings, who report that this case is grammatical, although their findings are not from the varieties that are discussed here). Regarding my consultants from Guayaquil, I found the following: one of them found (19) ungrammatical; two of them preferred the order in (19)a

<sup>6</sup> In line with what has been reported in the previous literature (see, e.g., Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022), adverbs that target the truth-conditions (such as *claramente* ‘clearly’) of the relevant proposition are degraded (I tested this with five of my Spanish consultants).

over the one in (19)b, but both sentences were degraded; one consultant found (19)b preferable over (19)a (but both were deemed degraded); one consultant considered that both cases are slightly degraded. Regarding my consultants from Lima, I found that all my consultants accepted both sentences in (19). My consultants from São Paulo judged both sentences in (20) as grammatical. The data reported would suggest that *dizque* has both an epistemic and an evidential component in that it seems to overlap with modal and evidential adverbs at least to some extent (section 0 disentangles these two components). I further suggest that the co-occurrence of *dizque* and *aparentemente* ‘apparently’ is more acceptable, because the latter does not implicate a particular kind of evidence, which *dizque* does (at least to some extent), as discussed in section 0.

- (19) a. La información está por todos lados: *dizque* aparentemente Odebrecht ha AS  
the information is for all places *dizque* apparently Odebrecht has  
demandado al gobierno de República Dominicana por unos negocios turbios.  
sued the government of Dominican Republic for some businesses shady
- b. La información está por todos lados: aparentemente *dizque* Odebrecht ha  
the information is for all places apparently *dizque* Odebrecht has  
demandado al gobierno de República Dominicana por unos negocios turbios.  
sued the government of Dominican Republic for some businesses shady  
‘The information is all over the place: apparently Odebrecht has sued the government  
of the Dominican Republic for some shady businesses, they say.’
- (20) a. A informação está em todos os lugares: *dizque* aparentemente a Odebrecht BP  
the information is in all the places *dizque* apparently the Odebrecht  
pediu ao governo da República Dominicana por uns negócios duvidosos.  
sued the government of the Dominican Republic for some businesses shady
- b. A informação está em todos os lugares: aparentemente *dizque* a Odebrecht  
the information is in all the places apparently *dizque* the Odebrecht  
pediu ao governo da República Dominicana por uns negócios duvidosos.  
sued the government of the Dominican Republic for some businesses shady  
‘The information is all over the place: apparently Odebrecht sued the government of  
the Dominican Republic for some shady businesses, they say.’

Consider now the co-occurrence of *dizque* and evaluative adverbs; these adverbs are located in a high position in the CP. In contrast to modal and evidential adverbs, there does not seem to be overlap in functions in this case. The co-occurrence of *dizque* and evaluative adverbs is deemed grammatical overall, with some variation with regard to what order is preferred. The consultants from Guayaquil accepted (21)a; (21)b was degraded for all of them. One consultant made the comment that *desgraciadamente* ‘unfortunately’ was in (partial) conflict with *dizque* in that such an adverb implies that the speaker takes the proposition for granted, which is at odds with *dizque*, which casts doubt over the proposition—this would emphasize the observation that *dizque* has an epistemic meaning. As for my consultants from Lima, three accepted both sentences in (21); two of them found them degraded, but preferred the order in (21)a. The speakers of BP accepted both sentences in (22), with some preference for (22)a. Overall, the data suggests that the sequence where *dizque* follows the evaluative adverbs would instantiate the canonical order.

- (21) a. Desgraciadamente *dizque* el ladrón consiguió escapar. AS  
unfortunately *dizque* the thief managed to escape
- b. *Dizque* desgraciadamente el ladrón consiguió escapar.

*dizque* unfortunately the thief managed to escape  
 ‘Unfortunately the thief managed to escape, they say.’  
 (adapted from Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022: 8)

- (22) a. Infelizmente *dizque* o ladrão conseguiu escapar. BP  
 unfortunately *dizque* the thief managed to escape  
 b. *Dizque* infelizmente o ladrão conseguiu escapar.  
*dizque* unfortunately the thief managed to escape  
 ‘Unfortunately the thief managed to escape, they say.’

The next tests turn to the discussion of modal verbs, both in deontic and epistemic scenarios. Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2022) claim that *dizque* may only appear in cases where the modal verb is deontic—these cases are to be understood in terms of a body of rules or laws that are followed. My findings do indicate that *dizque* may appear in such cases. As for the Spanish speaking consultants, the sentences in (23) and (25) are grammatical with only a few exceptions: (23)c was slightly degraded for two consultants (one from Guayaquil and one from Lima), and both sentences in (25) were degraded for one consultant. As for my consultants from São Paulo, the sentences in (24) and (26) are grammatical with one exception: one consultant found (26)b to be ungrammatical. These findings suggests that *dizque* can in fact appear in sentences involving deontic modality.

- (23) Se comportan como si no pasara nada, AS  
 CL behave as if no happens nothing  
 a. porque *dizque* la justicia no los puede tocar.  
 because *dizque* the justice no CL can touch  
 b. porque la justicia *dizque* no los puede tocar.  
 because the justice *dizque* no CL can touch  
 c. porque la justicia no los puede *dizque* tocar.  
 because the justice no CL can *dizque* touch  
 ‘They behave as if nothing happens, because justice cannot touch them, they say.’
- (24) Eles se comportam como se não estivesse acontecendo nada, BP  
 they CL behave as if no was happening nothing  
 a. porque *dizque* os policiais não podem tocar neles.  
 because *dizque* the policemen no can touch to.them  
 b. porque os policiais *dizque* não podem tocar neles.  
 because the policemen *dizque* no can touch to.them  
 c. porque os policiais não podem *dizque* tocar neles.  
 because the policemen no can *dizque* touch to.them  
 ‘They behave as if nothing happens, because the policemen cannot touch them, they say.’
- (25) a. *Dizque* el aporte a la cuenta bancaria debe hacerse el primero de AS  
*dizque* the contribution to the account bank must do.CL the first of  
 cada mes.  
 each month  
 b. El aporte a la cuenta bancaria *dizque* debe hacerse el primero de  
 the contribution to the account bank *dizque* must do.CL the first of  
 cada mes.  
 each month

‘The contribution to the bank account must be made on the first of every month, they say.’

- (26) a. *Dizque* o aporte da conta bancária deve ser feito no primeiro *BP*  
*dizque* the contribution of.the account bank must be made on.the first  
 dia de cada mês.  
 day of each month
- b. O aporte da conta bancária *dizque* deve ser feito no primeiro  
 the contribution of.the account bank *dizque* must be made on.the first  
 dia de cada mês.  
 day of each month  
 ‘The contribution to the bank account must be made on the first of every month, they say.’

The examples in (27)-(30) show the co-occurrence of *dizque* with epistemic possibility modal verbs.<sup>7</sup> I will indicate below that such cases are not completely out, in contrast to what Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2022) suggest. For (27)-(28), the context is one in which it was possible for the thief to escape, which is something that does not lie with what is expected within a body of norms. For (29)-(30), the relevant knowledge is that involving math, based on which a solution to a math problem is attempted. Regarding the Spanish cases in (27) and (29), (27)a, (27)b, and (29)a, where *dizque* precedes the modal verb, are grammatical. There is variation regarding (27)c and (29)b. With regard to (27)c, one consultant from Guayaquil judged it as ungrammatical and two considered it slightly degraded (for the other two, it was grammatical); as for the Peruvian speakers, (27)c was grammatical for two consultants, slightly degraded for one consultant, and ungrammatical for the two remaining consultants. With regard to (29)c, it was quite degraded for two consultants and slightly degraded for one consultant (for the other two, it was grammatical); as for the Peruvian speakers, (29)c was slightly degraded for two consultants and quite degraded for two consultants (one consultant found it grammatical). As anticipated, these findings contrast with what has been reported in the literature (see, e.g., Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022: 10), where sentences like (27)c and (29)c are expected to be ungrammatical, since the claim is that *dizque* can only appear in cases involving deontic modality, as the ones discussed above. As for Brazilian Portuguese, (28)c and (30)b are ungrammatical for all my consultants. As for (28)a,b, there is variation: three speakers found them grammatical, while two of them found them degraded; (30)a was grammatical for four consultants and ungrammatical for one of them. These findings would align better with Demonte & Fernández-Soriano’s (2022) claim for AS. It is worth pointing out that the cases where *dizque* precedes the modal verb may be analyzed as *dizque* taking scope over the modal verb (which is compatible with *dizque* moving to an evidential projection in the CP). The more interesting cases are those where *dizque* appears to scope under the modal (epistemic) verb, where variation is found, mostly in AS. The semantics of these cases is particularly relevant in that both elements would involve epistemic modality. Overall, *dizque* can appear more readily in cases involving deontic modality, but they are not ruled out (at least not categorically) in cases involving epistemic modality (see, e.g., Montgomery & Nagle 1993; Haider 2009; Zwart 2011 for discussion of the co-occurrence of two elements involving epistemic modality).

- (27) a. *Dizque* el ladrón pudo escapar. AS

<sup>7</sup> An anonymous reviewer suggests that the interaction between tense and modality is key to interpret the examples in (27)-(28) (see, e.g., Hacquard 2006). I leave this task for future research.

- dizque* the thief could escape
- b. El ladrón *dizque* pudo escapar.  
the thief *dizque* could escape
- c. El ladrón pudo *dizque* escapar.  
the thief could *dizque* escape  
'The thief could escape, they say.'
- (28) a. *Dizque* o ladrão pôde escapar. BP  
*dizque* the thief could escape  
b. O ladrão *dizque* pôde escapar.  
the thief *dizque* could escape  
c. O ladrão pôde *dizque* escapar.  
the thief could *dizque* escape  
'The thief could escape, they say.'
- (29) a. La solución al problema de matemáticas *dizque* puede ser esta. AS  
the solution to.the problem of math *dizque* can be this  
b. La solución al problema de matemáticas puede *dizque* ser esta.  
the solution to.the problem of math can *dizque* be this  
'The solution to the math problem can be this one, they say.'
- (30) a. A solução para o problema de matemática *dizque* pode ser esta. BP  
the solution for the problem of math *dizque* can be this  
b. A solução para o problema de matemática pode *dizque* ser esta.  
the solution for the problem of math can *dizque* be this  
'The solution to the math problem can be this one, they say.'

The next set of tests turns to further contexts in which *dizque* may (not) appear, namely, *dizque* with negation, *dizque* in questions and *dizque* in different kinds of subordinate clauses. As for negation, categorical contrasts were found in declarative sentences: *dizque* must precede negation (the opposite order is ungrammatical), as shown in (31)-(32). Interestingly, *dizque* cannot appear after negation in declarative sentences; such a case can only be tested in AS, because cases where *dizque* appears to combine with subclausal elements are not possible in BP in general (see section 0 for discussion of the so-called labelling function).<sup>8</sup> I further tested a negative adverb, yielding the same results, as in (33)-(34).<sup>9</sup>

- (31) a. Juan *dizque* no comió el almuerzo. AS  
Juan *dizque* no ate the lunch  
b. \*Juan no *dizque* comió el almuerzo.  
Juan no *dizque* ate the lunch

<sup>8</sup> An anonymous reviewer suggests that "the ungrammaticality in AS depends on the semantic incompatibility of labelling and sentence negation, but not on the position of *dizque*."

<sup>9</sup> A suggestion in this regard would be that *dizque* is a focus sensitive element (see Beaver & Clark 2008; Zimmermann 2011 for overviews on focus sensitivity), or, more generally, a discourse sensitive element (see Zimmermann 2011; Repp 2013 for overviews of discourse sensitive elements, such as common ground management operators). This would not be unheard of in the cross-linguistic picture: Martínez Vera (2020) proposes an analysis for an evidential that is a focus marker at the same time. Such an intuition (i.e., that an evidential is also a focus marker) is also present in the discussion of Cuzco Quechua (Faller 2002; Sánchez 2010).

- c. \*Juan no comió *dizque* el almuerzo.  
 Juan no ate *dizque* the lunch  
 ‘Juan didn’t eat lunch, they say.’
- (32) a. As crianças *dizque* não comeram o almoço. BP  
 the children *dizque* no ate the lunch  
 b. \*As crianças não *dizque* comeram o almoço.  
 the children no *dizque* ate the lunch  
 ‘The children didn’t eat lunch, they say.’
- (33) a. Juan *dizque* jamás dice la verdad. AS  
 Juan *dizque* never says the truth  
 ‘Juan never says the truth, they say.’  
 b. \*Juan jamás *dizque* dice la verdad.  
 Juan never *dizque* says the truth  
 c. \*Juan jamás dice *dizque* la verdad.  
 Juan never says *dizque* the truth  
 ‘Juan never says the truth, they say.’
- (34) a. As crianças *dizque* nunca comem verduras. BP  
 the children *dizque* never eat vegetables  
 b. \*As crianças nunca *dizque* comem verduras.  
 the children never *dizque* eat vegetables  
 ‘The children never eat vegetables, they say.’

I will now turn to the possibility of having *dizque* in different kinds of questions. I tested *dizque* in polar questions (35)-(36), *wh*-questions (37)-(40), and questions asking for confirmation (41)-(42). My Spanish speaking consultants shared judgments in this regard for the most part: *dizque* in polar questions (35) is grammatical for seven consultants (three Peruvian consultants found it ungrammatical); *dizque* can only follow, but not precede *wh*-words, i.e., (37) is ungrammatical and (39) is grammatical; questions asking for confirmation (41) are grammatical. As for my consultants from São Paulo, three consultants found (36) grammatical, while the other two found it ungrammatical; all five consultants indicated that (38)a is ungrammatical; (38)b is grammatical for all consultants; there is variation regarding (40): two consultants found it grammatical, one of them found it slightly degraded and the remaining two considered it to be ungrammatical; three consultants found (42) grammatical, and two of them found it degraded. What is clear is that *dizque* cannot precede the *wh*-word when such a word has been dislocated. Under the assumption that *wh*-movement is similar to focus movement, this would suggest that *dizque* may be focus sensitive (see footnote 9); BP is particularly interesting in this regard, since it allows *wh*-words in situ in the regular case (these cases may be related to the absence of quotative cases in the sense discussed in section 0; see Korotkova 2017, 2020). As for the variation in the other cases, it is possible for some evidentials to surface in polar questions and questions asking for confirmation (Martínez Vera 2020), which are similar in several respects to cases involving declaratives (Gunlogson 2008; Farkas & Bruce 2010; Malamud & Stephenson 2012; Gutzmann et al. 2020).

#### *Polar questions*<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The *they say* in the translation in (35)-(36) is to be understood as ‘according to what I (the speaker) hear.’

- (35) A esos políticos los tienen en la mira. *¿Dizque* los van a investigar? AS  
 those politicians CL have in the target *dizque* CL going to investigate  
 ‘Those politicians are being targeted. Are they going to investigate them, they say?’
- (36) Estes políticos estão sob suspeita. *Dizque* vão investigá-los? BP  
 these politicians are under suspect *dizque* going to investigate-CL  
 ‘Those politicians are being targeted. Are they going to investigate them, they say?’

*wh-questions*

- (37) \**¿Dizque* qué compró Pedro para navidad? AS  
*dizque* what bought Pedro for Christmas  
 ‘\*What did Pedro buy for Christmas, they say?’
- (38) a. \**Dizque* o que o Pedro comprou de natal? BP  
*dizque* the what the Pedro bought of Christmas  
 b. *Dizque* o Pedro comprou o quê de natal?  
*dizque* the Pedro bought the what of Christmas  
 ‘What did Pedro buy for Christmas, they say?’
- (39) *¿Qué dizque* compró Pedro para navidad? AS  
 what *dizque* bought Pedro for Christmas  
 ‘What did Pedro buy for Christmas, they say?’
- (40) O que *dizque* o Pedro comprou de natal? BP  
 the what *dizque* the Pedro bought for Christmas  
 ‘What did Pedro buy for Christmas, they say?’

*Confirmation questions*<sup>11</sup>

- (41) *¿Y no dizque* ibas a ir a la embajada? AS  
 and no *dizque* were going to go to the embassy  
 ‘Weren’t you going to the embassy, they say?’
- (42) E vocês não *dizque* iam ir na embaixada? BP  
 and you no *dizque* were going to go to.the embassy  
 ‘Weren’t you going to the embassy, they say?’

To end this section, I turn to the possibility of having *dizque* in different kinds of embedded clauses, i.e., in a *that*-clause with a verb of saying, in *if*- and *when*-clauses, in NPs starting with *the fact that* and in relative clauses. In general, it has been reported that the cases to follow are grammatical in AS. As with many of the previous cases, I have found variation in this domain as well. Overall, *dizque* can appear in embedded clauses, but there is speaker variation as to what clauses accept *dizque* in them. As for *dizque* in a *that*-clause with a verb of saying (I report cases with *dizque* in a preverbal position; there were no differences in judgments with *dizque* at the beginning of the embedded clause), (43) is grammatical for all my consultants from

<sup>11</sup> The *they say* in the translation in (41)-(42) is to be understood as ‘according to what I (the speaker) hear.’

Guayaquil, but it is grammatical for only two of my consultants from Lima—the other three found it ungrammatical.<sup>12</sup> The judgements from the BP speakers are identical to those from Guayaquil: (44) is grammatical.

- (43) *María dice que Juliana dizque es bien exigente.* AS  
 María says that Juliana *dizque* is very demanding  
 ‘Mary says that Juliana is very demanding, they say.’
- (44) A *María está falando que a Juliana dizque é bem exigente.* BP  
 the María is saying that the Juliana *dizque* is very demanding  
 ‘Mary says that Juliana is very demanding, they say.’

I will now discuss *dizque* in *if-* and *when-*clauses—these are islands for extraction, in contrast to *that-*clauses. For the speakers from Guayaquil, *dizque* can appear in these clauses, i.e., (45) and (47), which is similar to what was reported for embedding with verbs of saying. As for my consultants from Lima, in contrast to cases with embedding with verbs of saying, only one of them found (45) and (47) ungrammatical (this speaker also indicated that (43) was ungrammatical). The speakers from São Paulo show variation: (46) and (48) were very degraded for two speakers and slightly degraded for one speaker; the other two indicated that these sentences are grammatical. What is then found is that *dizque*’s distribution is not the same across embedded clauses (regardless of islandhood).

- (45) *Si dizque es urgente, el proceso se hace rápido.* AS  
 if *dizque* is urgent the process CL does quickly  
 ‘If it is supposedly urgent, the process is carried out quickly.’
- (46) *Se dizque as cirurgias são urgentes, elas acontecem rápido.* BP  
 if *dizque* the surgeries are urgent they take place quickly  
 ‘If the surgeries are supposedly urgent, they take place quickly.’
- (47) *Cuando dizque te quieren, pero no realmente.* AS  
 when *dizque* CL love but no really  
 ‘When they supposedly love you, but not really.’  
 (<https://twitter.com/velcromc/status/1184484705506344961>)
- (48) *Quando dizque te querem, mas não realmente.* BP  
 when *dizque* CL love but no really  
 ‘When they supposedly love you, but not really.’

The following cases report judgments of sentences with *dizque* in islands in nominal environments, specifically, environments with *the fact that* and relative clauses. My Spanish speaking consultants indicated that (49) and (51) are grammatical (here I include the example with *dizque* in a preverbal position for (49), but the same judgments hold for cases with *dizque* at the beginning of the embedded clause). As for my consultants from São Paulo, two of them indicated that the sentences in (50) are grammatical, and two of them indicated that they are ungrammatical; the remaining consultant only accepted (50)b. In contrast, (52) was grammatical for all of them.

<sup>12</sup> An anonymous reviewer points out that it may be possible that the verb of saying is doubled by *dizque* without adding an evidential meaning. It is not my impression that that was the judgment among my consultants. Nonetheless, this does mean that additional research is needed in this regard.



- (49) El hecho de que la educación *dizque* sea gratuita no es garantía de nada. AS  
 the fact of that the education *dizque* is free no is guarantee of anything  
 ‘The fact that the education is supposedly free does not guarantee anything.’
- (50) a. O fato de que *dizque* a educação é gratuita não é garantia de nada. BP  
 the fact of that *dizque* the education is free no is guarantee of anything
- b. O fato de que a educação *dizque* é gratuita não é garantia de nada.  
 the fact of that the education *dizque* is free no is guarantee of anything  
 ‘The fact that the education is supposedly free does not guarantee anything.’
- (51) No saben si la contactó su cliente o el que *dizque* la protegía. AS  
 no know if CL contacted her client or the that *dizque* CL protected  
 ‘They don’t know if her client or the one that supposedly protected contacted her.’
- (52) A polícia não sabe se foram os parentes da vítima ou aqueles que *dizque* BP  
 the police no knows if were the relatives of.the victim or those that *dizque*  
 moravam ao lado que roubaram as jóias.  
 lived to.the side that stole the jewels  
 ‘The police doesn’t know if the relatives of the victim or those who lived next door stole  
 the jewels.’

### 3.3. Additional uses

In this section, I would like to briefly discuss three tests that illustrate additional properties of *dizque* in the varieties under discussion. It is worth emphasizing that all the uses of the evidentials that appear in what follows (when grammatical) involve an epistemic meaning, in particular, an individual, the speaker here, expresses doubt towards the information that is communicated. The first use that is discussed consists of the use of *dizque* by itself, specifically, as an answer to a question. This use is present when answering a question, as exemplified below. Such an example was accepted by all my consultants. They further indicated that such a use is possible if the speaker doubts the proposition in the question. The judgments reported here contrast with what Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2022: 6) report, since they indicate that such uses represent cases where *dizque* in Peruvian Spanish is (only) reportative. The latter is particularly relevant, since I am reporting data from Peruvian Spanish that do not seem to be utterable in a context where only reported information is being communicated (since they involve a doubt meaning). From a syntactic point of view, (53)-(54) represent different strategies with regard to the characterization of elided material in Spanish and Portuguese (see Cyrino & Matos 2002 for an overview regarding the differences in ellipsis and stripping in these languages).

- (53) A: ¿Tiene mucho dinero ese tipo? AS  
 has a lot money that guy  
 ‘Does that guy have a lot of money?’  
 B: *Dizque*.  
*dizque*  
 ‘Supposedly.’  
 (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022: 6)

- (54) A: Esse cara tem muito dinheiro? BP  
 that guy has a lot money  
 ‘Does that guy have a lot of money?’  
 B: *Dizque* tem.  
*dizque* have  
 ‘Supposedly.’

The second use that I report here is the so-called labelling function of these evidentials (Travis 2006). This use of *dizque* involves what on the surface looks like the combination of the evidential and a subclausal constituent, such as an NP (or DP), an AP, a PP, etc. This is where a key difference between AS and BP is found, as exemplified below (the examples to follow are adapted from different sources; see Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022: 6). (55)-(56) illustrate cases where *dizque* combines with an NP. (57)-(59) exemplify cases where *dizque* combines with a PP. (60)-(62) illustrate cases where *dizque* combines with an AP. (58) exemplifies a case of *dizque* combining with a PP (such a possibility was too degraded in BP to be judged at all; its counterpart appears in (62), with an adjective). As can be noted in the contrasts below, AS allows for such uses in general; they are ungrammatical in BP with one exception: *dizque* is somewhat less degraded when combining with the PP complement of the verb in (59): three people considered it degraded (not ungrammatical), one person considered it ungrammatical, and one person accepted it. This is telling in that, as discussed above, *dizque* in both AS and BP appear to have a very strong epistemic (i.e., doubt) meaning (see the next section for explicit discussion of the semantics and pragmatics of these evidentials), which is present in the grammatical AS examples below. The distribution of *dizque* in BP is, however, more restricted when compared to its AS counterpart in that these labelling uses are almost completely out.

#### Dizque + NP

- (55) Juan trabaja con el *dizque* poeta de la universidad. AS  
 Juan works with the *dizque* poet of the university  
 ‘Juan works with the so-called poet of the university.’  
 (56) \*O João trabalha com o *dizque* poeta da universidade. BP  
 the Juan works with the *dizque* poet of the university  
 ‘\*Juan works with the so-called poet of the university.’

#### Dizque + PP

- (57) La conferencia se realizaba *dizque* sin el consentimiento de la policía. AS  
 the conference CL took place *dizque* without the consent of the police  
 ‘The conference was taking place without the consent of the police.’  
 (58) El chisme viene de las secretarias *dizque* de confianza. AS  
 the gossip comes of the secretaries *dizque* of trust  
 ‘The gossip comes from the so-called trustworthy secretaries.’  
 (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022: 6)  
 (59) A conferência estava acontecendo *dizque* sem o consentimento da polícia. BP  
 the conference was taking place *dizque* without the consent of the police  
 ‘The conference was taking place without the consent of the police.’

## Dizque + AP

- (60) En el trabajo, todos prefieren la comida sabrosa a la *dizque* nutritiva. AS  
 in the work everyone prefers the food tasty to the *dizque* nutritious  
 ‘At work everyone prefers tasty food over so-called nutritious food.’
- (61) \*No trabalho, todos preferem a comida saborosa do que a *dizque* nutritiva. BP  
 in.the work everyone prefers the food tasty to that the *dizque* nutritious  
 ‘\*At work everyone prefers tasty food over so-called nutritious food.’
- (62) \*A fofoca vem das secretárias *dizque* confiáveis. BP  
 the gossip comes of.the secretaries *dizque* trustworthy  
 ‘\*The gossip comes from the so-called trustworthy secretaries.’

The last use that I discuss in this section consists of *dizque* as a parenthetical, i.e., as elements that do not appear to affect the syntax of the host clause (its status as a parenthetical is represented by having *dizque* in-between commas).<sup>13</sup> The examples appear below. Here is where an additional difference between *dizque* in AS and BP is found. In AS, these examples are grammatical for all ten speakers, i.e., *dizque* can appear as a parenthetical in sentence-final position (63) and also in the middle of the sentence (65) when considering matrix clauses; it can also appear in an island, such as in a *when*-clause (67). In contrast, in BP, *dizque* in sentence-final position (64) is ungrammatical for all five speakers. The use of *dizque* in the middle of the sentence (66) has mixed results: three consultants found it natural, whereas two found it slightly degraded—this use is better for these two speakers when compared to (64). In *when*-clauses (68), one speaker found such a use degraded (note that in this case the parenthetical appears in the initial position of the embedded clause; this person found most uses of *dizque* in subordinate clauses degraded, as discussed in section 0). The reason why such differences arise in AS and BP is one of the issues that needs further research. As the literature points out, there are possible syntactic and semantic reasons as to why such uses could be (un)grammatical (see Potts 2005; Dehe & Kavalova 2007; Koev 2022 for comprehensive overviews on parentheticals that also discuss such issues). It is worth indicating as well that most speakers made the comment that these uses involve doubt. In fact, two Spanish speakers found (65) degraded on semantic grounds: they made the comment that *supuestamente* ‘supposedly’ and *dizque* had overlapping meanings, so that a(n unnecessary) redundancy, which they personally disliked, was found.

*Sentence-final dizque*

- (63) Vino acá muy contento, *dizque*. AS  
 came here very happy *dizque*  
 ‘He came here very happy, they say.’
- (64) \*Chegou aqui muito feliz, *dizque*. BP  
 came here very happy *dizque*  
 ‘\*He came here very happy, they say.’

<sup>13</sup> The cases to follow make use of the so-called comma intonation, i.e., *dizque* is flanked by intonation boundaries. I have not tested cases of parentheticals where such an intonation pattern is absent. I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for raising this issue.

- (65) Aquí supuestamente, *dizque*, nos lloverían los contratos de trabajo. AS  
 here supposedly *dizque* CL would.rain the contracts of work  
 ‘Here we would supposedly get many job contracts, they say.’

*Mid-sentence dizque*

- (66) Aquí supostamente, *dizque*, choveria contratos de trabalho. BP  
 here supposedly *dizque* would.rain contracts of work  
 ‘Here there would supposedly be many job contracts (for us), they say.’

- (67) Julián se ofrece a pagar el televisor que rompió cuando, *dizque*, quiso AS  
 Julián CL offers to pay the television that broke when *dizque* wanted to  
 matar a Roberto.  
 kill Roberto  
 ‘Julián offered to pay for the television he broke when, supposedly, he wanted to kill  
 Roberto.’  
 (adapted from Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022: 12)

- (68) O Júlio está se oferecendo para pagar a televisão que ele quebrou quando, BP  
 the Júlio is CL offering to pay the television that he broke when  
*dizque*, quis matar o Roberto.  
*dizque* wanted to kill the Roberto  
 ‘Júlio is offering to pay for the television he broke when, supposedly, he wanted to kill  
 Roberto.’

3.4. Summary

Below I summarize the tests and findings in Table 1. I loosely report the judgments in this section for ease of reference. The conventions adopted for Table 1 are as follows: when four or five consultants of a variety indicated that a sentence was grammatical, I use a checkmark (✓); when four or five consultants of a variety indicated that a sentence was ungrammatical, I use a star (\*); when two or three consultants of a variety indicated that a sentence was grammatical, I use a percentage symbol (%); N/A means that the test is not applicable (in general) in that variety. The symbol > is used to indicate precedence, e.g., *dizque* > *possibly* means that *dizque* precedes *possibly*. The symbol + is used to indicate co-occurrence, e.g., *dizque* + deontic modal means that both elements appear in the same sentence regardless of precedence. The reader is referred to the previous sections for additional details.

Table 1. Summary of the syntactic distribution

Test	AS		BP
	Guayaquil	Lima	São Paulo
<b>Quotative <i>dizque</i></b>			
Quotative <i>dizque</i> with different clauses	*	*	*
<b>Epistemic <i>dizque</i></b>			
Sentence-initial <i>dizque</i>	✓	✓	✓
Preverbal <i>dizque</i>	✓	✓	%
<i>dizque</i> > <i>possibly</i>	%	%	✓
<i>possibly</i> > <i>dizque</i>	%	%	%

<i>dizque</i> > apparently	%	✓	✓
apparently > <i>dizque</i>	%	✓	✓
<i>dizque</i> > unfortunately	*	%	✓
unfortunately > <i>dizque</i>	✓	%	✓
<i>dizque</i> + deontic modal	✓	✓	✓
<i>dizque</i> > epistemic modal	✓	✓	%
epistemic modal > <i>dizque</i>	%	%	*
<i>dizque</i> > negation	✓	✓	✓
negation > <i>dizque</i>	*	*	*
<i>dizque</i> in polar question	✓	%	%
<i>dizque</i> > <i>wh</i> -word (dislocated)	*	*	*
<i>dizque</i> > <i>wh</i> -word (in situ)	N/A	N/A	✓
<i>wh</i> -word > <i>dizque</i>	✓	✓	%
<i>dizque</i> in conformation question	✓	✓	%
<i>dizque</i> in <i>that</i> -clauses	✓	%	✓
<i>dizque</i> in <i>if</i> - and <i>when</i> -clauses	✓	✓	%
<i>dizque</i> in <i>the fact that</i>	✓	✓	%
<i>dizque</i> in relative clause	✓	✓	✓
<b>Additional uses</b>			
<i>dizque</i> as answer to <i>yes/no</i> -question	✓	✓	✓
Labelling function of <i>dizque</i>	✓	✓	*
<i>dizque</i> as sentence-final parenthetical	✓	✓	*
<i>dizque</i> as sentence-mid parenthetical	✓	✓	✓

#### 4. Semantic and pragmatic properties

In this section, I discuss a series of semantic and pragmatic properties in connection to the evidentials under discussion. Section 0 discusses the different evidence types with which *dizque* is compatible. Section 0 turns to the discussion of commitment and challengeability possibilities for sentences with the evidentials under consideration by focusing on the scope proposition, the evidential proposition, and the epistemic (i.e., doubt) implication; the at-issue vs. not-at-issue distinction is relevant in the discussion. Section 0 summarizes the discussion. To the best of my knowledge, the properties to be discussed in what follows have not been explicitly targeted in the previous literature—an exception in this regard is the treatment of the reportative component of *dizque*, which has been argued to be compatible with reportative evidence (see Cruschina & Remberger 2008 for an overview) and has been treated as not-at-issue meaning (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2022). As indicated in section 0, *dizque* does not seem to be illocutionary in nature in these varieties (at least in connection to reporting somebody else's words). Finally, let me point out that, in the sections to come, I make use of the symbol # when there is semantic anomaly, as is usual convention in the literature.

##### 4.1. Evidence types

This section addresses different evidence types. I provide different contexts that explicitly target these. Specifically, I focus on the three most common types of evidence in the cross-linguistic picture, namely, direct evidence, reportative evidence, and inferential evidence (see, e.g., Willett 1988). I will start discussing reportative evidence, which is the type of evidence that *dizque* has been associated with in the literature (see Cruschina & Remberger 2008 for an overview). Then I will turn to cases with direct evidence, and, finally, I will discuss cases involving inferential evidence. It is worth pointing out that I will also provide scenarios that

control for the epistemic (i.e., doubt) implication that many uses of *dizque* have been claimed to have.<sup>14</sup>

With regard to reportative evidence, *dizque* has been claimed to be compatible with second-hand and third-hand evidence (i.e., different kinds of reports), as well as with reports resulting from traditional stories (Cruschina & Remberger 2008; see also Palmer 2001). These evidence types are targeted in what follows by means of different contextual scenarios. The target sentences are (69)-(72). The first contexts to be discussed involve second- and third-hand evidence ((69)-(70)), and traditional stories ((71)-(72)). Uttering these sentences both in AS and BP is felicitous against the contexts that specify that the information comes from a report (second- and third-hand). Most consultants indicated the (69)-(70) involved doubt on their behalf with regard to the information that was passed along; as for (71)-(72), traditional stories were not assumed to be true in general by my consultants. Let me point out some differences that were found across my consultants. As for my consultants from Guayaquil, three indicated that they preferred the order in (69)b, which suggests that the position of *dizque* seems to be sensitive to discourse factors—one consultant indicated the same preference in connection to (71). In these particular cases, the consultants would be sensitive to topichood: the contexts make María a very salient individual about which something is being said, so this element should precede *dizque*. Interestingly, the inverse was found for my consultants from Lima: two out of the five consultants strongly preferred the cases with sentence-initial *dizque* (the contexts that were tested were exactly the same; one consultant indicated the same preference in connection to (71)); the other three found both options in (69) possible. Similarly to the speakers from Lima, there were two consultants from São Paulo who strongly preferred the cases with sentence-initial *dizque*—one consultant indicated the same preference in connection to (72). We thus find a split between the speakers from Guayaquil, and those from Lima and São Paulo with regard to what they deemed as the preferred position of *dizque* against these contexts.

*Context (second-hand reportative evidence):* The speaker heard (from Rosa) that María would go to the cinema. The speaker tells (69) to somebody else.

*Context (third-hand reportative evidence):* The speaker heard from an unknown source that María went to the cinema and tells (69) to Susana.

- (69) a. *Dizque* María fue al cine. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies  
 b. María *dizque* fue al cine.  
 María *dizque* went to.the movies  
 ‘Mary went to the movies, they say.’

*Context (second-hand reportative evidence):* The speaker heard (from Rosa) that the girls would go to the cinema. The speaker tells (70) to somebody else.

*Context (third-hand reportative evidence):* The speaker heard from an unknown source that the girls went to the cinema and tells (70) to Susana.

---

<sup>14</sup> While *dizque* has been associated with reportative evidence in general, I decided to also include contexts involving direct and inferential evidence to be comprehensive (and explicitly rule them out). This is relevant, because previous literature has claimed that *dizque* is purely epistemic (see, e.g., De la Mora & Maldonado 2015), which, in principle, means that the consideration of evidence is orthogonal when discussing this element. See the discussion further below.

- (70) a. *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema. BP  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies  
 b. As meninas *dizque* foram no cinema.  
 the girls *dizque* went to.the movies  
 ‘The girls went to the movies, they say.’

*Context (traditional story):* The speaker knows some common traditional stories. While talking to a friend who has never heard about a particular story, the speaker tells (71) to this person.

- (71) a. *Dizque* Manco Cápac emergió del lago Titicaca. AS  
*dizque* Manco Cápac emerged from.the lake Titicaca  
 b. Manco Cápac *dizque* emergió del lago Titicaca.  
 Manco Cápac *dizque* emerged from.the lake Titicaca  
 ‘Manco Cápac emerged from Lake Titicaca, they say.’

*Context (traditional story):* The speaker knows some common Brazilian legends. While talking to a friend who has never heard about a particular legend, the speaker tells (72) to this person.

- (72) a. *Dizque* a sereia Iara vive no Rio Amazonas. BP  
*dizque* the mermaid Iara lives in.the river Amazon  
 b. A sereia Iara *dizque* vive no Rio Amazonas.  
 the mermaid Iara *dizque* lives in.the river Amazon  
 ‘The mermaid Iara lives in the Amazon River, they say.’

Due to the relevance of the doubt component of sentences with *dizque*, I further tested cases involving reportative evidence that also implicated the presence or absence of doubt. In particular, I provided contexts, such as the ones below, in which the speaker had reason to trust or not trust the information that was passed along by considering whether the source of information was trustworthy. The target sentences are (69) for AS and for (70) BP, which are repeated below as (73)-(74) for ease of reference. Overall, what was found across my Spanish speaking consultants is that (73) can be uttered when the speaker has reason to doubt her source of information; if the source is trustworthy, then it is in general infelicitous to utter a sentence with *dizque*. Some comments need to be made, however. Two speakers from Guayaquil and two speakers from Lima indicated that the case where the speaker trusts Rosa may be compatible with *dizque* due to a discourse (i.e., pragmatic) effect: even though the speaker has no reason to doubt what was told, one might still want to create an effect of doubt (or potential gossip) on the hearer. This is interesting, more broadly, because *dizque* would be tied to a doubt meaning, but such a doubt may be attributed to somebody else (not the speaker)—this issue needs further exploration. As for my consultants from São Paulo, it is possible to utter (74) if the source of the information is not trustworthy. As for the context where the source is trustworthy, two consultants indicated that they could utter (74) (see the discussion in section 0 with regard to the status of the doubt implication, i.e., whether it is a semantic or a pragmatic implication).

*Context (second-hand reportative evidence with doubt):* Rosa told the speaker that María went to the cinema. Rosa claims that she saw María going to the cinema. However, the speaker has doubts about Rosa’s claim, because she often lies. The speaker tells (73) to somebody else.

*Context (second-hand reportative evidence without doubt):* The speaker talks with Rosa over the phone. Rosa is trustworthy; the speaker trusts her completely. Rosa told the speaker that

María went to the cinema. The speaker has no reason to doubt what Rosa has said. The speaker hangs up the phone and tells (73) to somebody else.

- (73) a. *Dizque* María fue al cine. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies
- b. María *dizque* fue al cine.  
 María *dizque* went to.the movies  
 ‘Mary went to the movies, they say.’

*Context (second-hand reportative evidence with doubt):* Rosa told the speaker that the girls went to the cinema. Rosa claims that she saw the girls going to the cinema. However, the speaker has doubts about Rosa’s claim, because she often lies. The speaker tells (74) to somebody else.

*Context (second-hand reportative evidence without doubt):* The speaker talks with Rosa over the phone. Rosa is trustworthy; the speaker trusts her completely. Rosa told the speaker that the girls went to the cinema. The speaker has no reason to doubt what Rosa has said. The speaker hangs up the phone and tells (74) to somebody else.

- (74) a. *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema. BP  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies
- b. As meninas *dizque* foram no cinema.  
 the girls *dizque* went to.the movies  
 ‘The girls went to the movies, they say.’

The next evidence type that is discussed is direct. Here I make use of two contexts: one in which there is plain direct evidence, and a second one where there is reason to doubt one’s perception. The context where there is plain direct evidence is ungrammatical across varieties. As for the case with doubt, one consultant from Guayaquil, one consultant from Lima and one consultant from São Paulo indicated that it is possible to use *dizque* in such a context; for two other consultants (one from Guayaquil and one from São Paulo) the sentence improved quite a bit (when compared to the case without doubt), without it becoming (fully) felicitous. This would suggest that, to a limited extent, there are instances where *dizque* may be used in the presence of doubt only (the reportative component would not be necessary)—see the discussion in De la Mora & Maldonado (2015), who claim that Mexican Spanish *dizque* is fundamentally epistemic; perhaps this is a possible diachronic path that *dizque* may undertake.

*Context (direct evidence):* The speaker saw a stain on the floor and tells (75)-(76) to somebody else.

*Context (direct evidence with doubt):* The speaker normally wears glasses. If she doesn’t wear them, everything is very blurry. She distinguishes something on the white floor of the kitchen; it’s reddish and looks like a red stain (it’s very likely that it is a stain), but she cannot tell for sure. She leaves the kitchen and tells (75)-(76) to somebody else in her household.

- (75) *Dizque* hay una mancha en el piso. AS  
*dizque* there.is a stain on the floor  
 ‘(Apparently) there is a stain on the floor.’



- (76) *Dizque* há uma mancha no piso. BP  
*dizque* there.is a stain on.the floor  
 ‘(Apparently) there is a stain on the floor.’

To end this section, I turn to cases involving inferential evidence. I discuss one case where the speaker draws an inference based on the available information; I further discuss one case where an inference can be drawn but it is not conclusive. The purpose of the latter is to determine whether in the presence of doubt (i.e., in a scenario where one cannot draw definitive inferences), using *dizque* would be possible. Overall, these cases are infelicitous. As in the previous cases, there are interesting comments to be made. One consultant from Guayaquil accepted (77) in the context involving doubt; a different consultant from Guayaquil as well found (77)b only slightly degraded in that same context ((77)a was infelicitous). One consultant from São Paulo judged (78) as felicitous against both contexts involving an inference. As indicated above, there would be some limited sense in which *dizque* may be compatible with cases that do not involve reportative evidence.

*Context (inferential evidence)*: The speaker lives with two roommates, María and Susana. María has a bike. If the bike is not at home, it’s because she went to the gym. The speaker arrives home and notices that neither María nor the bike are home. Susana arrives home a little bit later. The speaker tells (77) to Susana.

*Context (inferential evidence with doubt)*: The speaker lives with two roommates, María and Susana. María has a bike. If the bike is not at home, it’s because she went to the gym or the park. The speaker arrives home and notices that neither María nor the bike are home. Susana arrives home a little bit later. The speaker tells (77) to Susana.

- (77) a. *Dizque* María se fue al gimnasio. AS  
*dizque* María CL went to.the gym  
 b. María *dizque* se fue al gimnasio.  
 María *dizque* CL went to.the gym  
 ‘Mary must have gone to the gym.’

*Context (inferential evidence)*: The speaker lives with two colleagues, Maria and Susana. They (Maria and Susana) have a car. If the car is not at home, it’s because they went to the gym. The speaker arrives home and notices that they are not home; the car isn’t here either. Talking over the phone with a friend, the speaker tells (78) to this person.

*Context (inferential evidence with doubt)*: The speaker lives with two colleagues, Maria and Susana. They (Maria and Susana) have a car. If the car is not at home, it’s because they went to the gym or to the park. The speaker arrives home and notices that they are not home; the car isn’t here either. Talking over the phone with a friend, the speaker tells (78) to this person.

- (78) a. *Dizque* as minhas colegas foram na academia. BP  
*dizque* the my colleagues went to.the gym  
 b. As minhas colegas *dizque* foram na academia.  
 the my colleagues *dizque* went to.the gym  
 ‘My colleagues went to the gym.’

#### 4.2. Commitment and challengeability

This section discusses the commitment and challengeability possibilities in connection to these evidentials. As for commitment, the goal is to determine what meaning components in sentences with *dizque* are entailed. In particular, in what follows it is tested whether the scope proposition is entailed, whether the evidential proposition is entailed, and whether the doubt implication is entailed. As for challengeability, the goal is to determine what meaning components are at-issue and not-at-issue. This is tied to the possibility of directly or indirectly questioning specific meaning components, in this case, the scope proposition, the evidential proposition, and the doubt implication (see Murray 2017 for a recent overview of these tests). Commitment is discussed first; the discussion then continues with challengeability. The details of each test are also addressed in what follows.

With regard to commitment, I will first discuss the commitment to the scope proposition. Due to the (assumed) epistemic (i.e., doubt) component of *dizque*, I focus on a test that targets the belief state of the speaker (see, e.g., Matthewson et al. 2007; Smirnova 2021). This test involves a sentence with *dizque* that is followed up by a sentence that indicates whether the speaker believes the scope proposition indicated in the first sentence. As indicated, the focus of this test lies in the mental states of the relevant individual (the speaker here), i.e., the follow-up indicates whether the scope proposition is in the belief worlds of the that individual. The test is of the form *but I don't believe it*. The reasoning is that if the speaker believes what she stated, then it would be infelicitous to indicate that she does not believe it. All my consultants indicated what the follow-ups are felicitous, which suggests that the scope proposition is not necessarily believed by the speaker (when uttering a sentence with *dizque*). What this test suggests is that, when an individual utters a sentence with *dizque*, she is not making a commitment with regard to scope proposition.

- (79) a. *Dizque* María fue al cine, pero yo no lo creo. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies but I no CL believe  
 b. María *dizque* fue al cine, pero yo no lo creo.  
 María *dizque* went to.the movies but I no CL believe  
 ‘María went to the movies, they say, but I don’t believe it.’
- (80) a. *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema, mas eu não acredito. BP  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies but I no believe  
 b. As meninas *dizque* foram no cinema, mas eu não acredito.  
 the girls *dizque* went to.the movies but I no believe  
 ‘The girls went to the movies, but I don’t believe it.’

The next test that I discuss regards the commitment to the evidential proposition. This test involves a follow-up of the form *but nobody told me that*. This follow-up targets whether there must be reportative evidence when uttering a sentence with *dizque*. The results indicate that such a follow-up is infelicitous across varieties. A comment must be made, however. As discussed in the previous section, *dizque* is compatible with different kinds of reportative evidence (e.g., it can be second-hand evidence, but it can also be third-hand or come from a traditional story). In this regard, my consultants made the comment that they deemed conceivable to utter sentences such as those in (81)-(82) when they had, e.g., a written form with the evidence, in particular, if they saw the information on the internet or in the news—the examples in (81)-(82) were commonly understood as if somebody must have had told the information directly to the speaker. This is relevant in that it confirms that *dizque* is rather unconstrained when it comes to the reportative evidence that must be available to the speaker

(as suggested in the previous section). Overall, however, it seems that there must be some form of reportative evidence for it to be possible to utter a sentence with *dizque*.

- (81) a. #*Dizque* María fue al cine, pero nadie me dijo eso. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies but nobody CL said that  
 b. #María *dizque* fue al cine, pero nadie me dijo eso.  
 María *dizque* went to.the movies but nobody CL said that  
 ‘#María went to the movies, they say, but nobody told me that.’
- (82) a. #*Dizque* aqueles meninos foram no cinema, mas ninguém me disse isso. BP  
*dizque* those boys went to.the movies but nobody CL said that  
 b. #Aqueles meninos *dizque* foram no cinema, mas ninguém me disse isso.  
 those boys *dizque* went to.the movies but nobody CL said that  
 ‘#Those boys went to the movies, they say, but nobody told me that.’

The last test to be discussed in connection to commitment regards commitment to the doubt implication that sentences with *dizque* appear to have. For this case, I propose a test with the follow-up *but I don't have doubts about it*. By means of such a follow-up it is targeted whether the doubt implication is entailed (e.g., whether the doubt meaning of (83)-(84), i.e., that the speaker is unsure whether some individual(s) went to the movies, is entailed). My findings are as follows: one consultant from Guayaquil, three consultants from Lima, and two consultants from São Paulo indicated that the continuation is infelicitous. The rest of my consultants mentioned that the continuation is possible. These mixed results suggest that the epistemic meaning of doubt is entailed for some consultants, but not for others. This is perhaps surprising considering that, as I have indicated at various places, my consultants indicated once and again that the sentences with *dizque* have a doubt flavor. The question that needs an answer would be the following: what is the status of such an epistemic meaning? I suggest that, for the speakers for which such a meaning does not appear to be entailed (i.e., semantic), it is an implicature (i.e., pragmatic), and, as such, may be canceled. This suggestion will be strengthened below when discussing challengeability—it will be shown that such a meaning can be explicitly targeted (which means that it is present), which, in combination to the data in (83)-(84) would indicate that these meaning is an implicature (for those speakers who find (83)-(84) felicitous).

- (83) a. *Dizque* María fue al cine, pero yo no tengo dudas al respecto. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies but I no have doubts to.the regard  
 b. María *dizque* fue al cine, pero yo no tengo dudas al respecto.  
 María *dizque* went to.the movies but I no have doubts to.the regard  
 ‘María went to the movies, they say, but I don't have doubts about it.’
- (84) a. *Dizque* os meninos foram no cinema, mas eu não tenho dúvidas a BP  
*dizque* the boys went to.the movies but I no have doubts to  
 respeito disso.  
 regard of.this  
 b. Os meninos *dizque* foram no cinema, mas eu não tenho dúvidas a  
 the boys *dizque* went to.the movies but I no have doubts to  
 respeito disso.  
 regard of.this  
 ‘The boys went to the movies, they say, but I don't have doubts about it.’

Having discussed the commitment tests, I will now turn to the challengeability possibilities that are associated with sentences with *dizque*, i.e., different forms that aim at questioning what has been uttered. This is relevant in connection to the at-issue vs. not-at-issue distinction—at-issue meanings are proffered content (i.e., what is proposed in context); not-at-issue meaning corresponds with imposed content (i.e., what is assumed as a given) (see AnderBois et al. 2015). In particular, the literature indicates that at-issue meanings can be directly challenged, i.e., one can explicitly question some meaning; not-at-issue meanings, in contrast, cannot be directly challenged. Not-at-issue meanings can only be indirectly challenged, i.e., these meanings can be targeted by asking for further clarification in connection to them. In what follows, I discuss direct challengeability first, and then turn to indirect challengeability.

The direct challengeability test involves an exchange where somebody reacts to what was said by means of expressions such as *That's not true* or *You're mistaken* (see Korotkova 2016 for discussion regarding the distinctions between the two tests; here I use both for thoroughness). Then, a challenge is proposed. In the examples in (85)-(86), the scope proposition (*that María went to the movies* or *that the girls went to the movies*) is challenged. As expected, the scope proposition in sentences with *dizque* can be challenged by all my consultants. This suggests that the scope proposition is at-issue.<sup>15</sup>

- (85) A: *Dizque* María fue al cine. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies  
 'María went to the movies, they say.'  
 B1: Eso no es cierto. María no fue al cine.  
 that no is true María no went to.the movies  
 'That's not true. María didn't go to the movies.'  
 B2: Estás equivocado. María no fue al cine.  
 are mistaken María no went to.the movies  
 'You're mistaken. María didn't go to the movies.'

---

<sup>15</sup> An additional test to determine whether some meaning is at-issue is based on question-answer pairs (see Roberts 1996; Tonhauser 2012). Somebody asks for some information. Only at-issue meanings can address explicit requests for information. Below I provide examples with a general *what happened* question. One can answer with a sentence with *dizque*, in particular, the scope proposition in this case provides an answer to the question.

- (i) A: ¿Qué pasó?  
 what happened AS  
 'What happened?'  
 B1: *Dizque* María fue al cine.  
*dizque* María went to.the movies  
 B2: María *dizque* fue al cine.  
 María *dizque* went to.the movies  
 'María went to the movies, they say.'
- (ii) A: O que aconteceu?  
 the what happened BP  
 'What happened?'  
 B1: *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema.  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies  
 B2: As meninas *dizque* foram no cinema.  
 the girls *dizque* went to.the movies  
 'The girls went to the movies, they say.'

Questions targeting the evidential proposition (e.g., *what's your evidence for that*) and the doubt implication (e.g., *what doubts do you have about it*) could also be asked. They yield infelicity when answered with a sentence with *dizque*. This would suggest that the evidential proposition and the doubt implication are not-at-issue.

- (86) A: *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema. BP  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies  
 ‘The girls went to the movies, they say.’  
 B1: Isso não é certo. As meninas não foram no cinema.  
 that no is true the girls no went to.the movies  
 ‘That’s not true. The girls didn’t go to the movies.’  
 B2: Você está enganado. As meninas não foram no cinema.  
 you are mistaken the girls no went to.the movies  
 ‘You’re mistaken. The girls didn’t go to the movies.’

I now turn to a direct challenge of the evidential proposition. Here the challenge involves an indication that the speaker was not told what was reported. This is done by the expression *Nobody told you that* after *That’s not true* or *You’re mistaken*. In a context in which the speaker has reportative evidence (e.g., second-hand), my consultants indicate that the direct challenges are infelicitous. This suggests that the evidential proposition is not-at-issue. Some consultants actually indicated explicitly that the *Nobody told you that* seemed strange after *That’s not true*, because they were expecting a continuation about someone going to the movies.

- (87) A: *Dizque* María fue al cine. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies  
 ‘María went to the movies, they say.’  
 B1: Eso no es cierto. #Nadie te dijo eso.  
 that no is true nobody CL said that  
 ‘That’s not true. #Nobody told you that.’  
 B2: Estás equivocado. #Nadie te dijo eso.  
 are mistaken nobody CL said that  
 ‘You’re mistaken. #Nobody told you that.’
- (88) A: *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema. BP  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies  
 ‘The girls went to the movies, they say.’  
 B1: Isso não é certo. #Ninguém te disse isso.  
 that no is true nobody CL said that  
 ‘That’s not true. #Nobody told you that.’  
 B2: Você está enganado. #Ninguém te disse isso.  
 you are mistaken nobody CL said that  
 ‘You’re mistaken. #Nobody told you that.’

To end the discussion of direct challenges, I turn to the doubt implication. Here I propose a challenge that involves an indication that the speaker has no doubts about what is being shared. This is done here by means of the expression *You don’t have doubts about it* after *That’s not true* or *You’re mistaken*. My consultants said that such a challenge is infelicitous; it was pointed out to me by some of my consultants that it does not sound like an appropriate continuation after *That’s not true* or *You’re mistaken*, and that there is a clash in that one would be saying that individual A is a liar (because using *dizque* conveys that the speaker has some reservations or doubts with regard to what is being communicated). Overall, this suggests that the doubt implication is not-at-issue.

- (89) A: *Dizque* María fue al cine. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies  
‘María went to the movies, they say.’  
B1: Eso no es cierto. #Tú no tienes dudas al respecto.  
that no is true you no have doubts to.the regard  
‘That’s not true. #You don’t have doubts about it.’  
B2: Estás equivocado. #Tú no tienes dudas al respecto.  
are mistaken you no have doubts to.the regard  
‘You’re mistaken. #You don’t have doubts about it.’
- (90) A: *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema. BP  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies  
‘The girls went to the movies, they say.’  
B1: Isso não é certo. #Você não tem dúvidas a respeito disso.  
that no is true you no have doubts to regard of.that  
‘That’s not true. #You don’t have doubts about it.’  
B2: Você está enganado. #Você não tem dúvidas a respeito disso.  
you are mistaken you no have doubts to regard of.that  
‘You’re mistaken. #You don’t have doubts about it.’

To end the discussion in this section, I turn to the indirect challengeability test, which is used in connection to not-at-issue meanings, which can be brought up by means of clarification questions, i.e., more information is requested (see Murray 2017 for an overview). Below I apply the indirect challengeability test to the evidential proposition and the doubt implication. With regard to the evidential proposition, the follow-up asks for clarification with regard to the report, in this case, a question about who told the speaker what is being reported. The data are shown in (91)-(92). With regard to the doubt implication, the follow-ups in (93)-(94) ask for clarification with regard to the presence of doubt for the speaker. These indirect challenges are felicitous, which suggests that these meanings can be targeted by means of clarification questions—thus suggesting that these meanings are not-at-issue. In connection to the doubt implication, recall that the data in (83)-(84) suggest that the doubt implication is an implicature in that it seems cancelable for some consultants. The indirect challenges in (93)-(94) target this (potentially cancelable) meaning—if such a meaning were not present, questioning it would be infelicitous, i.e., why would one question a meaning that is not present in what was previously communicated.

- (91) A: *Dizque* María fue al cine. AS  
*dizque* María went to.the movies  
‘María went to the movies, they say.’  
B: ¿Y quién te dijo eso?  
and who CL said that  
‘And who told you that?’
- (92) A: *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema. BP  
*dizque* the girls went to.the movies  
‘The girls went to the movies, they say.’  
B: E quem te disse isso?  
and who CL said that

‘And who told you that?’

(93) A: *Dizque* María fue al cine. AS

*dizque* María went to.the movies

‘María went to the movies, they say.’

B1: ¿Te quedan dudas al respecto?

CL left doubts to.the regard

‘Do you have doubts about it’

B2: ¿Y qué dudas tienes?

and what doubts have

‘And what doubts do you have?’

(94) A: *Dizque* as meninas foram no cinema. BP

*dizque* the girls went to.the movies

‘The girls went to the movies, they say.’

B1: E você tem dúvidas a respeito disso?

and you have doubts to regard of.that

‘And do you have doubts about it?’

B2: E que dúvidas você tem?

and what doubts you have

‘And what doubts do you have?’

#### 4.2. Summary

This section summarizes the discussion in sections 0-0 in Table 2. The following conventions are used: ✓ is used when applying the test is felicitous for at least four consultants; # is used when applying the test is infelicitous for at least four consultants; % is used when there are mixed results. The reader is referred to the previous sections for more nuanced discussion.

Table 2. Summary of the semantic and pragmatic properties

Test	AS		BP
	Guayaquil	Lima	São Paulo
<b>Evidence types</b>			
Reportative evidence (second-hand)	✓	✓	✓
Reportative evidence (third-hand)	✓	✓	✓
Traditional story	✓	✓	✓
Reportative evidence with doubt	✓	✓	✓
Reportative evidence without doubt	#	#	%
Direct evidence	#	#	#
Direct evidence with doubt	#	#	#
Inferential evidence	#	#	#
Inferential evidence with doubt	#	#	#
<b>Commitment</b>			
Follow-up denying belief of the scope proposition	✓	✓	✓
Follow-up with commitment to the evidential proposition	#	#	#
Follow-up with commitment to the doubt implication	✓	%	%
<b>Challengeability</b>			

Direct challenge of the scope proposition	✓	✓	✓
Direct challenge of the evidential proposition	#	#	#
Direct challenge of the doubt implication	#	#	#
Indirect challenge of the evidential proposition	✓	✓	✓
Indirect challenge of the doubt implication	✓	✓	✓

## 5. Conclusion

This paper has discussed the indirect evidential markers *dizque* in American Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese. I focused on two varieties of Spanish, namely, the varieties of Guayaquil (Ecuador) and Lima (Peru). I further focused on Brazilian Portuguese, specifically, the variety of São Paulo (Brazil). I adopted a comparative approach in which I discussed their syntax and semantics by documenting their properties in a theoretically driven approach. To this end, I prepared a comprehensive questionnaire building on previous literature. Data from five consultants per variety were gathered; fieldwork practices were followed. The purpose of this approach has been to complement previous studies, whose main focus has been on corpora. With regard to the syntax of *dizque*, I discussed its distribution in connection to a number of different elements, e.g., modal, evidential and evaluative adverbs, as well as *dizque* in questions, with negation, etc. I further showed that the use of *dizque* as an illocutionary evidential is, in general, disallowed in these varieties. With regard to the semantics and pragmatics of *dizque*, I discussed the types of evidence with which these evidentials are compatible, in particular, I showed that reportative evidence is, in general, needed to utter a sentence with *dizque*. I further discussed the at-issue vs. not-at-issue distinction and the doubt implication that sentences with these elements normally have. The scope proposition is at-issue, and the evidential proposition and the doubt implication are not-at-issue. The doubt implication may be semantic (an entailment) or pragmatic (an implicature); there is speaker variation in this regard. This work further suggests that *dizque* in American Spanish has moved further along grammaticalization (and pragmaticalization) when compared to its Brazilian Portuguese counterpart. Specifically, *dizque* in American Spanish has developed more uses than *dizque* in Brazilian Portuguese in terms of the labelling function (i.e., taking constituent scope). In addition, *dizque* in American Spanish can appear in sentence final position (on top of sentence initial and post-topic position), but this is not the case of *dizque* in Brazilian Portuguese. Overall, this study made an attempt at providing a comprehensive overview of these evidentials in these varieties. Building on such a comprehensive approach, future research may single out different properties and study them in controlled (e.g., experimental) settings.

Gabriel Martínez Vera  
 School of English Literature, Language and Linguistics  
 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
 Newcastle University  
 NE1 7RU, Newcastle upon Tyne  
 United Kingdom  
 gabriel.martinez-vera@newcastle.ac.uk

## References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.



- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Evidentiality in Grammar. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 320–325. Oxford: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00252-2>
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2018. *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198759515.001.0001>
- Alcázar, Asier. 2014. On the grammaticalization of *dizque*. In Andrés Enrique Arias, Manuel J. Gutiérrez, Alazne Landa & Francisco Ocampo (eds.), *Perspectives in the study of Spanish Language Variation*, 20–42. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
- Alcázar, Asier. 2018. *Dizque* and other emergent evidential forms in Romance languages. In Alexandra Aikhenvald (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, 725–740. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198759515.013.35>
- Anderbois, Scott. 2014. On the exceptional status of reportative evidentials. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 24. 234–254. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v24i0.2424>
- AnderBois, Scott, Adrian Brasoveanu & Robert Henderson. 2015. At-issue Proposals and Appositive Impositions in Discourse. *Journal of Semantics* 32. 93–138. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/fft014>
- Babel, Anna. 2009. *Dizque*, evidentiality, and stance in Valley Spanish. *Language in Society* 38. 487–511. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404509990236>
- Bary, Corien & Emar Maier. 2021. The landscape of speech reporting. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 14(8). <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.14.8>
- Beaver, David & Brady Clark. 2008. *Sense and Sensitivity*. Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444304176>
- Bhadra, Diti. 2018. Evidentials are syntax-sensitive: The view from Bangla. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3(1). 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.449>
- Bhadra, Diti. 2020. The Semantics of Evidentials in Questions. *Journal of Semantics* 37. 367–423. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffaa003>
- Bochnak, M. Ryan & Lisa Matthewson (eds.). 2015. *Methodologies in semantic fieldwork*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190212339.001.0001>
- Bowern, Claire. 2008. *Linguistic fieldwork: A practical guide*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230590168>
- Brasoveanu, Adrian & Donka Farkas. 2007. Say reports, assertion events and meaning dimensions. In Gabriela Alboiu, Andrei A. Avram, Larisa Avram & Daniela Isac (eds.) (2007), *Pitar Moș: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 175–196, Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Casseb Galvão, Vânia Cristina. 2001. *Evidencialidade e gramaticalização no português do Brasil: Os usos da expressão diz que*. Araraquara: Universidade Estadual Paulista.
- Chung, Kyung-Sook. 2007. Spatial-deictic tense and evidentials in Korean. *Natural Language Semantics* 153. 187–219. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-007-9017-8>
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs as functional heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio & Eva-Maria Remberger. 2008. Hearsay and reported speech: Evidentiality in Romance. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 33. 95–116.
- Cyrino, Sonia & Gabriela Matos. 2002. VP ellipsis in European and Brazilian Portuguese – a comparative analysis. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 1(2). 177–195. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jpl.41>
- Davis, Henry, Carrie Gillon & Lisa Matthewson. 2014. How to investigate linguistic diversity: Lessons from the Pacific Northwest. *Language* 90(4). 180–226. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2014.0076>

- De la Mora, Juliana & Ricardo Maldonado. 2015. *Dizque*: Epistemics blurring evidentials in Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 85. 168–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.019>
- Dehé, Nicole & Yordanka Kavalova. 2007. *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.106>
- Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2013. Evidentials *dizque* and *que* in Spanish: grammaticalization parameters, and the (fine) structure of Comp. *Linguística: Revista de Estudos linguísticos da Universidade do Porto* 8. 211–234.
- Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2020. *Dizque*. Un evidencial reportativo modal en la periferia izquierda oracional. In Esther Hernández Palacios & Pedro Martín-Butragueño (eds.), *Elementos de variación lingüística. La palabra*, 185–218. México, D.F.: CSIC - El Colegio de México.
- Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2022. A multidimensional analysis of the Spanish reportative epistemic evidential *dizque*. *Lingua* 266. 103168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103168>
- Dendale, Patrick & Liliane Tasmowski. 2001. Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33. 339–348. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00005-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00005-9)
- Faller, Martina. 2002. *Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Stanford University dissertation.
- Faller, Martina. 2012. Evidential scalar implicatures. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 35. 285–312. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-012-9119-8>
- Faller, Martina. 2019. The discourse commitments of illocutionary reportatives. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 12(8). 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.12.8>
- Farkas, Donka & Kim Bruce. 2010. On Reacting to Assertions and Polar Questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27. 81–118. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffp010>
- von Fintel, Kai & Anthony S. Gillies. 2011. Must Stay Strong! *Natural Language Semantics* 18. 351–383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-010-9058-2>
- Grajales, Róbinson. 2017. La estrategia evidencial *dizque* en el español de Medellín, Colombia. *Onomázein* 37. 244–278. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.37.02>
- Gunlogson, Christine. 2008. A question of commitment. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 22. 101–136. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.22.06gun>
- Gutzmann, Daniel, Katharina Hartmann & Lisa Matthewson. 2020. Verum focus is verum, not focus: Cross-linguistic evidence. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5(1). 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.347>
- Hacquard, Valentine. 2006. *Aspects of Modality*: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Virginia Hill. 2013. The Syntacticization of Discourse. In Rafaella Folli, Christina Sevdali & Robert Truswell (eds.), *Syntax and its Limits*, 370–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199683239.003.0018>
- Haider, Hubert. 2009. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hernanz, María Lluïsa (2007). From polarity to modality: Some (a)symmetries between *bien* and *si* in Spanish. In Luis Eguren & Olga Fernández Soriano (eds.), *Coreference, modality, and focus: Studies on the syntax-semantics interface*, 133–169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.111.08her>
- Izvorski, Roumyana. 1997. The present perfect as an epistemic modal. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 7. 222–239. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v7i0.2795>
- Kany, Charles. 1944. Impersonal *dizque* and its variants in American Spanish. *Hispanic Review* 12, 168–177. <https://doi.org/10.2307/469712>
- Koev, Todor. 2011. Evidentiality and temporal distance learning. *Proceedings of Semantic and Linguistic Theory* 21. 115–134. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v21i0.2594>

- Koev, Todor. 2017. Evidentiality, Learning Events, and Spatiotemporal Distance: The View from Bulgarian. *Journal of Semantics* 34. 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffv014>
- Koev, Todor. 2018. Notion of at-issueness. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 12. 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12306>
- Koev, Todor. 2022. *Parenthetical Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198869535.001.0001>
- Korotkova, Natasha. 2016. *Heterogeneity and uniformity in the evidential domain*. University of California Los Angeles dissertation.
- Korotkova, Natasha. 2017. Evidentials and (relayed) speech acts: Hearsay as quotation. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 25. 676–694. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v25i0.3969>
- Korotkova, Natalia. 2020. Evidential meaning and (not-)at-issueness. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 13(4). 1–24 <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.13.4>
- Lau, Monica & Johan Rooryck. 2017. Aspect, evidentiality, and mirativity. *Lingua* 186–187. 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2016.11.009>
- Lee, Jungmee. 2011. *Evidentiality and its interaction with tense*. Ohio State University dissertation.
- López Izquierdo, Marta. 2006. L'émergence de dizque comme stratégie médiative en espagnol médiéval. *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales* 29. 483–493. <https://doi.org/10.3406/cehm.2006.1980>
- Magaña, Elizabeth, 2005. El paso de “dice que” a “dizque”, de la referencia a la evidencialidad. *Contribuciones desde Coatepec* 8. 59–70.
- Malamud, Sophia & Tamina Stephenson. 2012. Three ways to avoid commitents: the pragmatics of declarative force modifiers. *Sinn und Bedeutung* 16. 403–416.
- Martínez Vera, Gabriel. 2020. *On the Semantics of Evidentials in Southern Aymara*. University of Connecticut dissertation.
- Matthewson, Lisa. 2004. On the methodology of semantic fieldwork. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70. 369–415. <https://doi.org/10.1086/429207>
- Matthewson, Lisa, Hotze Rullman and Henry Davis. 2007. Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St'a t'imcets. In Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (ed.), *Linguistic variation yearbook 2007*, vol. 7, 201–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.7.07mat>
- McCready, Eric. 2015. *Reliability in Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Montgomery, Michael B. & Stephen J. Nagle. 1993. Double modals in Scotland and the Southern United States: Trans-Atlantic inheritance or independent development? *Folia Linguistica Historica* 14. 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flih.1993.14.1-2.91>
- Mortelmans, Tanja. 2000. On the ‘evidential’ nature of the ‘epistemic’ use of the German modals *müssen* and *sollen*. In Johan van der Auwera and Patrick Dendale (eds.), *Modal verbs in Germanic and Romance languages*, 131–148. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.14.08mor>
- Murray, Sarah. 2010. *Evidentiality and the structure of speech acts*. Rutgers University dissertation.
- Murray, Sarah. 2014. Varieties of Update. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 7(2). 1–53. <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.7.2>
- Murray, Sarah. 2017. *The semantics of evidentials*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199681570.001.0001>
- Olbertz, Hella. 2005. ‘Dizque’ en el español andino ecuatoriano: conservador e innovador. In Hella Olbertz and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *Encuentros y conflictos: bilingüismo y contacto de lenguas*, 77–94. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberamericana-Vervuert, Madrid Frankfurt. <https://doi.org/10.31819/9783865278968-005>

- Olbertz, Hella. 2007. *Dizque* in Mexican Spanish: the subjectification of reportative meaning. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19. 151–172.
- Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139167178>
- Pancheva, Roumyana & Deniz Rudin. 2019. Speaker discourse roles and the discourse profile of reportative evidentials. *Proceedings of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Amsterdam Colloquium*. 327–336.
- Peterson, Tyler Roy Gösta. 2010. *Epistemic modality and Evidentiality in Gitksan at the Semantics- Pragmatics Interface*: University of British Columbia dissertation.
- Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199273829.001.0001>
- Plungian, Vladimir A. 2001. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Studies in Language* 12(1). 349–357. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00006-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00006-0)
- Repp, Sophie. 2013. Common ground management: Modal particles, illocutionary negation and verum. In Daniel Gutzmann & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Beyond expressiveness. Explorations in Use-Conditional Meaning*, 231–274. Leiden: Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004183988\\_008](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004183988_008)
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7)
- Roberts, Craige. 1996. Information structure in discourse: towards an integrated theory of pragmatics. *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics* 49. 91–136.
- Saito, Hiroaki. 2019. Grammaticalization and the Root & Category Theory. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 54. 461–476.
- Saito, Hiroaki. 2021. Grammaticalization as Decategorization. *Journal of Historical Syntax* 5(10). 1–24.
- Sánchez, Liliana. 2010. *The Morphology and Syntax of Topic and Focus: Minimalist inquiries in the Quechua periphery*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.169>
- Sanromán Vilas, Bengoña. 2020. Do evidential markers always convey epistemic values? A look into three Ibero-Romance reportatives. *Lingua* 238. 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102832>
- Sauerland, Uli & Mathias Schenner. 2007. Embedded evidentials in Bulgarian. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 11. 525–539.
- Schwager, Magdalena. 2010. On what has been said in Tagalog. In Tyler Peterson and Uli Sauerland (eds.), *Evidence from Evidentials*, 221–246. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Şener, Nilüfer. 2011. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Turkish*: University of Connecticut dissertation.
- Smirnova, Anastasia. 2013. Evidentiality in Bulgarian: Temporality, Epistemic Modality, and Information Source. *Journal of Semantics* 30. 479–532. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffs017>
- Smirnova, Anastasia. 2021. Evidentiality in abductive reasoning: Experimental support for a modal analysis of evidentials. *Journal of Semantics* 38. 531–570. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffab013>
- Tonhauser, Judith. 2012. Diagnosing (not-)at-issue content. *Semantics of Under-Represented Languages in the Americas* 6. 239–254.
- Travis, Catherine. 2006. *Dizque*: a Colombian evidentiality strategy. *Linguistics* 44(6). 1269–1297. <https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2006.041>
- Van der Auwera, Johan & Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. Modality's Semantic Map. *Linguistic Typology* 2. 79–124. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1998.2.1.79>

- Willett, Thomas. 1988. A crosslinguistic survey of the grammaticization of Evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12(1). 51–97. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.12.1.04wil>
- Zimmermann, Malte. 2011. Discourse particles. In Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, 2011–2038. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2011. *The Syntax of Dutch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763>