

Sources of knowledge in talk-in-interaction (KNOWINT 2022), Università della Svizzera italiana, February 7-9, 2022

Book of abstracts

Modal and beyond. A model for the annotation of modality in spoken dialogues and its applications

Paola Pietrandrea

Université de Lille, France

The talk describes a theoretical framework for modeling the epistemic and evidential constructions occurring in Italian spoken dialogues. Having assessed on spoken data the traditional notion of commitment used in the literature on epistemicity, I propose to revisit it within the framework of a dynamic, interactional, communitarian semantics. Having refined the functional definition of the domain, I will single out, through a corpus-driven methodology, the functional and formal properties that characterize epistemic and evidential constructions. On this ground, I will define an annotation scheme for epistemicity. I will apply such a scheme to a large sample of Italian dialogic spoken data. Based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the annotated corpus, I will sketch out a new grammar of Italian dialogic epistemic and evidential constructions.

Interactional lessons for evidential typology

Ilana Mushin

The University of Queensland, Australia

In this paper, I consider how taking an interactional approach to the study of epistemics enriches the study of evidential typology both methodologically and theoretically. Since the early 20th Century, the typological study of evidential systems has been primarily concerned with regularities in the mapping of evidential meanings – e.g. witnessed or first hand information, reported, inferred or second hand information - onto a paradigmatically arranged set of (usually) bound forms. On the other hand, pragmatic approaches to the status of knowledge have considered the contexts in which evidential expressions are used, and the ways in which particular stances are regularly adopted for particular discourse purposes. Similarly, conversation analysts and interactional linguists have been concerned with the management of knowledge in interaction, noting that the design of conversational turns is highly sensitive to what speakers and recipients actually know, and what they should know, and the deployment of epistemic stances for particular communicative purposes. On the surface these two approaches – the typological and the pragmatic – seem to operate on different foundational assumptions, with one concerned with the cross-linguistic comparison of grammatical systems, and the other concerned with what speakers are doing when they talk. However, I will suggest ways that these might be reconciled in order to develop a more substantive foundation for doing typological research, that includes explanations for the typological regularities we see in evidential systems across languages.

French evidential markers in talk-in-interaction. Diving into complexity, getting out of perplexity?

Jérôme Jacquin

Université de Lausanne, Switzerland

Evidential markers and – more generally – the linguistic domain of ‘epistemicity’ have been studied quite extensively in French Linguistics, but mostly from a semantic and/or syntactic perspective and by using either invented or decontextualized examples. Corpus studies remain scarce, they often focus on one or few markers, and most of the time they do not integrate pragmatic factors such as sequentiality (i.e. cotextual features), genericity (i.e. contextual features) and multimodality (i.e. polysemiotic features). The paper stems from an ongoing, 4-year research project whose goal is to study French epistemic and evidential markers as they emerge in a 28h video-recorded corpus documenting public debates, TV debates, and work meetings. After a short introduction to the main theoretical and methodological options adopted by the project to analyze – both quantitatively and qualitatively – a wide range of French epistemic/evidential markers, the paper provides a case study on 328 tokens of verbs and adverbs of appearance (verbs: *sembler*, *paraître*, *avoir l’air*, *avoir l’impression* et *donner l’impression*; adverbs: *apparemment*, *évidemment*, *manifestement*, *visiblement*). Quantitative analysis focuses on the general distribution of the verbs and adverbs by discourse genres, communicative roles, and sequential positioning; Multimodality – notably (shifts of) gaze direction and gestures associated with the markers – is also considered. Qualitatively, the paper examines the most frequent expressions in the corpus (e.g. *il me semble (que) [it seems to me (that)]*), by scrutinizing variations of meaning and functions related to sequential positioning (e.g. initiative versus reactive position) and types of scope (i.e. in terms of factuality). The paper concludes with some general remarks about the interest of combining qualitative and quantitative methods for the study of epistemic and evidential markers at the interface of semantics and pragmatics.

Knowledge, talk and body: from epistemics to sensoriality in social interaction

Lorenza Mondada

University of Basel, Switzerland

The talk discusses how different forms of knowledge are observable and made accountable in social interaction. From an ethnomethodological and conversation analytic perspective, it reflects on how participants orient to the relevance of and the differences between propositional knowledge (knowing that), embodied knowledge and sensoriality. By studying interactional contexts in which the participants engage in producing and exchanging information about objects, in manipulating these objects and in sensing them, the paper explores how participants differentiate various sources of knowledge. The analyses show how epistemic access, primacy and authority are publicly displayed and addressed by the participants but also how the limitations of knowledge as information are pointed at by them. They also show how in some contexts - such as interactions around food - participants move from talking about objects to sensing them, treating sensoriality as a distinct form of access to materiality. On the basis of video-recorded activities involving food, such as interactions in gourmet shops and tasting sessions among amateurs and professionals, the study demonstrates how participants locally differentiate relevant sources of knowledge and orient to their distinct features. This paves the way for a reflection that articulates issues of knowledge, embodiment and sensoriality in social interaction.

Individual presentations

Manifesting puzzlement over game outcomes: Access, knowledge and agency

Burak S. Tekin

AYBU, Turkey

This paper deals with the ways through which people in video game playing activities manifest puzzlement over the game outcomes and how they are responded to by those who watch the gameplay. Adopting the mentality of conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, this paper aims to reconstruct the perspective of participants in the ways they treat and orient to the negative outcomes in the video game playing activity through a sequential analysis. This study draws on a corpus of circa 22 hours of video recordings of people playing video games in which they produce the game moves with their entire bodies.

This paper specifically focuses on "allahallah" interjections in Turkish that players use in the aftermath of negative game outcomes. Allahallah interjections involve the repetition of "God" twice, prosodically glued to one another. It is usually uttered with rising intonation, and its last syllable is often elongated. When packaged in this way, they usually convey a feeling of puzzlement and confusion. Allahallah interjections, dissociated from their religious connotations, do not involve any specific agents or verbs or even question words, thereby they signal a trouble without formulating and describing it explicitly.

In the setting studied herein, while players hold a first-hand perspective by dint of producing game movements with their own bodies, spectators have an outsider perspective that may provide themselves with opportunities to see player bodies and game screens in relational ways. Yet, with regard to the different game outcomes, different participants may experience what happened in different ways. The analysis posits that access could be better characterized as graded, as opposed to binary (Stivers, et al., 2011). Various aspects of access to both the players' bodies and the game screens afford different actions in a contingent manner.

This paper analyzes both how allahallah interjections orient to the game outcomes and how they are treated by spectators. The analysis demonstrates that spectators usually deal with the legitimacy of puzzlement displays, responding to them with formulations of and about game rules and events, thereby both implying the players' lack of knowledge and treating their puzzled positions as irrelevant and illegitimate. Moreover, allahallah interjections are also responded to with diagnostic assessments and instructions, which shows their treatments as searching for causes for the outcomes. Furthermore, they may also not mobilize any response from spectators.

Presenting a large spectrum of the different treatments of allahallah interjections, this paper elucidates the ways through which people exhibit the kind of access they have in building their actions. With puzzlement displays, players imply a lack of transparency about the game outcomes (Dourish & Button, 1998). The responses to allahallah interjections usually deal with their relevancy and credibility, as well as attributing responsibility and blame (Pomerantz, 1978; Watson, 1978). This paper aims to contribute to i) the sequential organization of interaction in Turkish, ii) the social organization of actions in socio-technical environments where access to and knowledge about what happened is treated as relevant.

Giving examples

Jakub Mlynar¹, Ye Ji Lee²

¹University of Applied Sciences Western Switzerland (HES-SO); ²University of Basel, Switzerland

This paper explores the ordinary work of giving examples as a recurrent way of establishing intersubjective knowledge. Despite its ubiquity, giving examples has rarely been a subject of research on talk-in-interaction. Analyzing knowledge transfer between medical experts and non-experts, Gülich (2003) lists exemplification as one of the "techniques" used. De Stefani et al. (2016) unpack the "interactional history" of the use of example-giving in collaborative writing within mutual-help groups, confirming that examples provide additional information, but also textually preserve relevant aspects of previous spoken discussions. Working on college-level ESL classrooms, Lee (2004) shows that teachers recurrently exemplify an indexical expression or a course of action.

Our study examines a collection of instances of example-giving in language classroom interaction. In general, giving examples is discussed as an important practice in the course of learning a language (Cook, 2013), and students' knowledge is often evaluated by requiring examples that are provided "in a way which implied they understood a generality" (Houssart & Evens, 2005). Alternately, approaching the topic through ethnomethodological conversation analysis, our aim in this paper is to start from actual speech episodes, investigating just how and when people give examples in interaction, and what are the interactional consequences. As an initial inquiry, we examine sequences with the phrase "for example".

The focal phenomenon of this study is a member of the classroom giving examples to demonstrate understanding of another member's experience or idea. We have identified three ways in which examples are used to establish common understanding in the ongoing course of action: (1) confirmatory examples (the exemplified entity is ratified by concluding a sequence with an unambiguous example); (2) expository examples (the exemplified is clarified by bringing up potential examples); and (3) transformative examples (the exemplified is altered by extending the entity to include the given example). We argue that giving an example of another's experience or idea entails not only an understanding of the content of the exemplified entity; the exemplifying action also treats the exemplified as being a source for particular examples and not others. The study highlights members' sense-making work involved in occasioning and formulating examples as they are sequentially made relevant and understood as an interactional resource.

REFERENCES

- Cook, V. 2013. *Second language learning and language teaching*. Routledge.
- De Stefani, E. et al. 2016. The interactional history of examples and parentheses: Note-taking practices in multiparty interaction among attendees of a mutual-help group for Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS) sufferers. *Language and Dialogue* 6(1): 110–139.
- Gülich, E. 2003. Conversational techniques used in transferring knowledge between medical experts and non-experts. *Discourse Studies* 5(2): 235–263.
- Houssart, J., and Evens, H. 2005. Giving examples and making general statements: 'two odds always make an even (in maths)'. In D. Hewitt and A. Noyes (eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth British Congress of Mathematics Education*, pp. 65–72. <https://bsrlm.org.uk/publications/proceedings-of-day-conference/ip25-1/>
- Lee, Y.-A. 2004. The work of examples in classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education* 15(1–2): 99–120.

In situ sources of information: practices of knowledge-management in cooperative meal preparations

Christian Geddo

Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland

The notion of evidentiality, which has been defined as the grammatical/lexical expression of information sources related to an asserted proposition (cf. Willet 1988, Aikhenvald 2004, Squartini 2007), has been predominantly examined from a logocentric perspective. Conversation analysis (CA) has also considered the role of knowledge in social interaction, identifying three main dimensions (access, primacy, responsibility, cf. Stivers et al. 2011). However, even if CA has abundantly studied the participants' embodied conduct (e.g., Goodwin 2000, Deppermann 2013), its role within the management of situational and local information sources is still underinvestigated. This contribution examines how knowledge and expertise emerge and are locally organised in a perspicuous setting, i.e. multi-party meal preparations (cf. Galatolo/Traverso 2005, Mondada 2014). In particular, focusing on both multisensoriality (cf. Mondada 2021) and reciprocal coordination in food-making activities, we explore how participants select and categorise **perceptible elements** of the surrounding context as **interactionally-relevant sources of information**, to co-construct knowledge in the unfolding of conversation. The analysis is based on a subset of the TIGR corpus, which encompasses video-recorded cooking and eating activities among Italian speakers in Switzerland. We have collected cases in which participants indicate and categorise *in situ* ordinary objects as sources of knowledge, and not only as mere referents for their conversation. Focusing on both turn-design and embodied conduct, we investigate practices to address a possibly limited/asymmetrical access to *in situ* sources, as a condition for the progression of the ongoing activity. We show that participants establish a shared perception of the contextual element (i) through addressee-oriented practices, such as showing (Licoppe 2017), or (ii) by autonomously (re-)orienting themselves towards *in situ* sources. (i) and (ii) can be considered evidential practices in the broad sense. Furthermore, we describe the sequential organisation of these practices, by identifying 3 phases (triggering action, access creation, response).

Aikhenvald, A. Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press.

Deppermann, A. 2013. Multimodal interaction from a conversation analytic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46, 1-7.

Galatolo, R. & Traverso, V. 2005. Two cooks at work: independent and coordinated lines of action. *Le Corps En Interaction. Actes Du Colloque de Lyon*, L. Mondada (ed.).

Goodwin, C. 2000. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1489-1522.

Licoppe, C. 2017. Showing objects in Skype video-mediated conversations: From showing gestures to showing sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 110, 63-82.

Mondada, L. 2014. Cooking instructions and the shaping of things in the kitchen. *Interacting with Objects*. M. Nevile et al. (eds.), 199-226. John Benjamins

Mondada, L. 2021. *Sensing in Social Interaction: the taste for cheese in gourmet shops*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Squartini, M. (Ed.). 2007. *Evidentiality between lexicon and grammar*. Special issue of *Italian Journal of Linguistics*.

Stivers, T., Mondada, L. and Steensig, J. 2011. Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation* 29: 3-24.

Willet, T. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language"*, 12(1), 51-97.

L'evidenzialità nel corpus KIParla: tra discorso e meta-discorso

Maria Cristina Lo Baido¹, Caterina Mauri²

¹Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Italy; ²Università degli Studi di Bologna, Italy

L'evidenzialità nel corpus KIParla: tra discorso e meta-discorso

Intendiamo studiare l'evidenzialità nel corpus KIParla (661,175 tokens, Mauri et al. 2019) intesa come l'espressione delle fonti e del modo di conoscenza del parlante (Squartini 2008). Analizzeremo alcuni predicati parentetici (Schneider et al. 2015), studiandone il profilo e analizzando il contesto sequenziale in cui tali strategie vengono usate per esprimere nozioni connesse, in genere, con l'inferenza e il ragionamento. Riteniamo che i parentetici siano strategie compatibili con le proprietà del parlato, modalità in cui l'espressione delle fonti può essere comunicata a livello implicito e/o attraverso mezzi non sintatticamente integrati eventualmente mediante processi cooperativi. Classificheremo i tipi di evidenza con attenzione ai valori intersoggettivi (*sa*) e al ragionamento inferenziale che individua il parlante come sorgente e come soggetto valutatore (*deduco*). Valuteremo il ruolo del co-testo per identificare e classificare funzioni evidenziali talvolta connesse con la dimensione retorica, argomentativa (Miecznikowski 2020) e con il grado di 'ovvietà' dell'informazione nella portata dei parentetici. Nella classificazione dei valori evidenziali delle costruzioni sarà cruciale la definizione dell'unità di base del parlato e della nozione di periferia (Pietrandrea 2018): distingueremo tra posizioni periferiche e mediane all'interno di enunciati più o meno verbali. Includeremo sia predicati routinizzati, sia strutture analitiche studiando la semantica dei predicati di origine, i tratti morfo-sintattici e le collocazioni. Intendiamo contribuire a una modellizzazione dell'evidenzialità nel parlato mediante strategie parentetiche che – sebbene sintatticamente sganciate – possano gettare luce sul processo di esplicitazione delle fonti e del modo di conoscenza nel dominio parlato. L'interesse per i parentetici costituisce un ritorno a un tema classico studiato in diversi paradigmi (Urmson 1952, Borillo 1982, Venier 1991). Tali studi tralasciano l'aspetto della dimensione parlata che invece in questa sede riteniamo cruciale. Di seguito si riportano alcuni risultati dello studio quantitativo (170 occorrenze di parentetici evidenziali e 46 casi di parentetici che fanno appello alle conoscenze condivise). La prima funzione seleziona in genere predicati di prima persona singolare che si formano attraverso *verba dicendi*, verbi assertivi forti e deboli. Tali parentetici sono variabili sul piano distribuzionale. La funzione evidenziale di tipo interazionale è più frequentemente distribuita in posizione mediana e iniziale mediante verbi semifattivi.

Borillo, A. 1982. Deux aspects de la modalisation assertive: croire et savoir. *Langages* 67, 33-53.

Mauri, C., Ballarè, S., Gorla, E., Cerruti, M., Suriano, F. 2019. F. KIParla corpus: a new resource for spoken Italian. In R. Bernardi, R. Navigli, G. Semeraro (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6° Italian Conference on Computational Linguistics CLiC-it*.

Miecznikowski, J. 2020. At the juncture between evidentiality and argumentation. *Journal of Argumentation in Context*, 9(1), 42-68.

Pietrandrea, P. 2018. Epistemic constructions at work. A corpus study on spoken Italian dialogues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 128, 171-191.

Schneider, S., Glikman, J., M. Avanzi (Eds.). 2015. *Parenthetical verbs*. De Gruyter.

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

Urmson, J. O. 1952. Parenthetical verbs. *Mind* 61, 480-496.

Venier, F. 1991. *La modalizzazione assertiva. Avverbi modali e verbi parentetici*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Inferential evidentiality in spoken Italian dialogues

Elena Battaglia

Università della Svizzera italiana, Italy

In Italian, inferential evidentiality has been analysed as encoded by the future, the modal verb *dovere* and some adverbs, and classified as circumstantial, generic or conjectural on the basis of the kind of evidence available to the speaker (Squartini 2008). The fact that such evidence can be textually spelled out by way of arguments (Rocci 2012) and/or multimodally referred to in the speech situation, thus becoming available to all participants, has however received little empirical attention.

This contribution investigates inferential evidentiality from an interactional perspective, focusing on the role of co(n)textual evidence as a trigger of an indexical and intersubjective reasoning, which emerges as a relevant source for establishing shared knowledge. It is based on a collection of sequences in around 20h of informal conversation in various corpora of spoken Italian.

We analyse cases, exemplified below, where participants present a propositional content *p* as based on inferences while negotiating epistemic stances towards it (cf. Pietrandrea 2018). Relevant parameters include the sequential organization of action, the optional availability of co(n)textual evidence, the optional presence of linguistic cues indicating an inference (e.g., evidential markers, connectives, epistemic parentheticals), the experiencers of the inference (speaker, hearer, both).

1 BO046: *ma infatti scusate, maretta quando torna?*

exactly, tell me please when is maretta coming back?

2 BO021: *eh mi sa a inizio mese*

at the beginning of the month I think

3 BO046: *ah proprio?*

oh really?

4 BO021: *eh perché lei il ritorno non l'aveva preso*

because she hadn't booked the ticket back

5 BO047: *lei aveva (detto) che si faceva due settimane tipo*

she said she was going to have like two weeks at home

In our data, (a) propositions in dialogue are not only presented as inferred by the speaker (*mi sa*, I.2) but are also (co-)constructed online as jointly inferable from co(n)textual information (I.4-5); (b) this co-construction often takes place at the textual level by cross-turn patterns of clause combination with (e.g. *perché*, I.4) or without (I.5) overt discourse connectives, (c) and is realized incrementally through argumentative moves, which respond to epistemic challenges (I.3) and back up tentative answers (I.1-2). Such a dialogic activity of justification and positioning (Jacquin 2014) can serve as a context-dependent evidential strategy (cf. Miecznikowski 2016).

The sequential and argumentative structure of dialogic data suggests recasting evidential grounding through inferences as a collaborative and emergent accomplishment adapted to interactional contingencies, while an account in terms of linguistic markers seems insufficient.

- Jacquin, J. (2014). *Débatte. L'argumentation et l'identité au coeur d'une pratique verbale*. De Boeck.
- Miecznikowski, J. (2016). An experience that apparently differs a lot from mine". Evidentials in discourse: The case of gastronomic discussions. In S. Greco, M. Danesi (eds.), *Case studies in discourse analysis*. Lincom Europa:270-298.
- Pietrandrea, P. (2018). Epistemic constructions at work. A corpus study on spoken Italian dialogues. *Journal of Pragmatics*,128:171-191.
- Rocci, A., 2012. Modality and argumentative discourse relations: A study of the Italian necessity modal *dovere*. *Journal of Pragmatics*,44(15):2129-2149.
- Squartini, M. (2008). Lexical Vs. Grammatical Evidentiality In French And Italian. *Linguistics*,46(5):917-947.

Verbs of seeing as evidentials: Hebrew 'ata ro'e and Estonian näed 'YOU SEE'

Hilla Polak Yitzhaki¹, Marri Amon², Yael Maschler¹, Leelo Keevallik³

¹University of Haifa, Israel; ²University of Tartu, Estonia; ³Liköping University, Sweden

This study compares the Hebrew SUBJ-PRED perception verb construction 'at/a ro'e/a (you.2M/F.SG see.PRS.2M/F.SG) with the Estonian equivalent PRED+SUFFIX *näed* (see.PRS.2SG) ('YOU(SG) SEE'). We argue that these constructions can be highly formulaic, do not necessarily denote visual seeing, but are often employed to express evidentiality. We show that their uses are closely tied to their prosodic features, to particular activities in which participants engage, and to the bodily-visual conduct of the speaker.

The two Hebrew (Semitic) and Estonian (Finno-Ugric) verbs of seeing are considered transitive verbs. However, an analysis of the investigated constructions containing these verbs throughout an audio- and videotaped corpora of natural Hebrew and Estonian interactions (23 hours of everyday Hebrew interactions; 31 hours of Estonian everyday, professional and experimental interactions) reveals their routinization into metalingual fragments functioning as discourse markers.

Employing interactional linguistic methodology, we build on earlier studies of perception verbs (e.g., Keevallik 2008, Whitt 2011, Miller Shapiro 2014, San Roque et al. 2018, Kendrick 2019), which point out the relation between seeing and evidentiality.

The great majority of Hebrew YOU SEE tokens (1) point out evidence supporting a previous assertion based on visual data or (2) invite recipients to consider the just prior talk as proof of a speaker's previous assertion/stance, as in the following Hebrew excerpt:

1 Dad: *mi holex la-sifriya ha-le'umit?*

who goes to the National Library?

(3 intervening IUs)

5 Mom: *tsila gam hayta ba-sifriya ha-le'umit be-london.*

Tsila too was at the National Library in London.

6 Neta: 'o!

PRT

7 ..'ata ro'e?

you.M.SG see.PRS.M.SG

..you see?

8 'ani lo levad. I'm not alone.

Dad criticizes Neta's desire to visit national libraries when going abroad (l.1). Mom points out that her friend, too, had gone to the national library while visiting London (l.5). In response, Neta produces the non-lexical vocalization 'o' followed by 'ata ro'e?' (l.6-7), instructing Dad to treat Mom's utterance as evidence supporting Neta's stance that her desire to visit the library is not odd but rather quite common. Indeed, Neta then adds 'I'm not alone' (l.8).

Such tokens of the YOU SEE construction, which fulfill the requirements of a prototypical discourse marker (Maschler 2009), occur in their own separate intonation unit (Chafe 1994) and are articulated in sentence-final rising intonation. Their production is accompanied by the speaker's pulling the head backwards, usually while raising the eyebrows and holding one hand in a PUOH gesture – embodied behavior unattested for the other functions of the construction.

Similarly, in the Estonian conversational data we can document a pattern of turn initial *näed* followed by the specification of what is to be understood as evidence supporting prior discourse. In this use *näed* is produced with a separate, mostly high onset intonation contour, in combination with other particles functioning as formulaic fragments.

Our study demonstrates the relation between sedimentation of discourse markers and the embodied conduct accompanying them in two languages, revealing the interlaced nature of grammar, the body, and interaction, thus widening our cross-linguistic understanding of involvement of perception verb constructions into discourse markers.

From "j'ai vu que" ('I saw that') to "vous voyez que" ('you see that'): Evidential forms and pragmatic functions of the verb "voir" ('see') in French in interaction

Clotilde Marie Robin

Université de Lausanne, Switzerland

The present paper will analyse evidential forms of the French verb *voir*, as they emerge in a video-recorded corpus of Swiss-French natural data, consisting of televised debates (5 hours), public debates (9 hours) and work meetings (14 hours). While studies on evidential *voir* have mainly focused on the infinitive form *voir* in French scientific publications (Grossmann, 2009; Grossmann & Tutin, 2010), on the inflected forms *tu vois/vous voyez* 'you see' (Bolly, 2010; Détrie, 2010) and on *à ce que je vois/peux voir* 'as I (can) see' (Schuring & Dendale, 2020) in written and oral corpora, no study has specifically investigated the pragmatic functions of evidential forms of *voir* in face-to-face interaction.

We thus propose a study of this verb of perception *in context*, from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective. A very first step will be to discuss and define whether a specific form is evidential or not. In this presentation, we will focus in particular on subordinate forms, i.e. *that*-clauses, which commonly introduce a propositional scope (a criterion formulated by Boye (2010, 2012)). Among these specific forms, we will then discuss which ones can be perceived as evidential. We will mobilise certain criteria formulated in the literature (such as the "m-performativity" criterion (Faller, 2002)) to sort out these tokens. In a second step, a quantitative analysis will be performed to identify the evidential forms preferred by the interlocutors, their frequency, and their context of appearance. The various forms will be classified using an annotation scheme tackling different variables: syntactic categories (status, scope), enunciative-discursive contexts (role of interlocutors), interactional/sequential environment (position of the token in the turn constructional unit, in the turn, in the sequence) and multimodality (gaze, gesture). The fine-grained annotation will also show whether these evidential markers are more often related to *direct evidentiality* – *voir* is the most prototypical verb in this category – or whether they are more often used as *inferential markers* (see the demonstration by Schuring and Dendale, 2020, on the expression *à ce que je vois*). On a more qualitative level, we will consider how these evidential forms contribute to the construction of 'epistemic stance' (K+/K- rights, Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Heritage, 2012) in interaction. Indeed, more than just indicating the source of information, evidential markers also consist of resources for modulating the epistemic stance of speakers (González et al., 2017) and their use, in general, is « to a large degree influenced by how knowledge is distributed between speaker and addressee » (Grzech et al., 2020: 282). Thus, through a sequential analysis of a few excerpts from the corpus, we will look at how the use of these evidential forms elaborates epistemic stance.

“Mi mamá me dijo claramente”: Exploring territories of knowledge in complaint sequences in Spanish casual interactions

Andrea Rodriguez

The University of Queensland, Australia

“Mi mamá me dijo claramente”: Exploring territories of knowledge in complaint sequences in Spanish casual interactions

The role of epistemic domains in interaction is considered an underlying element that can determine how different social actions are accomplished (Heritage, 2012, Drew, 2018). Research has shown that as interactants position themselves in a particular epistemic status, they may claim knowledge rights and make imbalances of information sequentially relevant to the ongoing social action (see Heritage, 2012; Bolden, 2013). In the analysis of complaining, which is used as a vehicle for remedial action in relation to social troubles or for the achievement of affiliation (Heinemann & Traverso, 2009), the embeddedness of epistemics has often been taken for granted (see Drew, 2018). Consequently, how interlocutors orient to sources of knowledge in complaint sequences and its role in the achievement of an ‘intersubjective action ascription’ (Depperman & Haugh, 2021) remain underexplored. Moreover, the way in which different degrees of closeness between the interactants may affect epistemic displays in complaint sequences is yet to be examined. Using interactional and interpersonal pragmatics to analyse the moment-by-moment details of naturally occurring interaction within broader relational phenomena, this paper, aims to contribute to these gaps by exploring (1) how epistemic positionings in relation to sources of knowledge impact the way in which situation- and third-part-oriented complaints are interactionally achieved and (2) the extent to which different degrees of intimacy affect how epistemic imbalances emerge in complaint sequences. The dataset analysed here comes from the *TalkBank* repository of casual phone conversations in Latin-American Spanish between friends and relatives. The results show that when complaint recipients have first-hand access to the referred complainable, they may delegitimise the complainable through epistemic challenges (e.g. “really? That happened every now and then”), displaying disaffiliation. In these cases, while complainants may acknowledge the recipient’s epistemic status through action ascription, they may counter-challenge their epistemic stance. Similarly, during complaints on behalf of someone else, interactants may engage in epistemic competitions orienting to the right-to-know (e.g. reporting the witnessed complainable) or the right-to-voice a complainable matter (e.g. using quotative evidentials “Mum clearly told me that”), triggering selective affiliation (i.e. affiliation with some but not all complainables). In either case, the epistemic negotiations lead to different topicalization patterns that evidence degrees of closeness and intimacy. For example, while indirect complaint topicalizations tend to occur before the actual complaints between distant participants, topicalizations between intimates are provided after the complaint only when disaffiliation occurs.

Keywords: epistemics, complaints, sources of knowledge, (dis)affiliation, Spanish

References

- Bolden, G. (2013). Unpacking self: Repair and epistemics in conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 76(4), 314–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513498398>
- Depperman, A., & Haugh, M. (2021). Action ascription in social interaction. In A. Depperman & M. Haugh (Eds.), *Action ascription in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (2018). Epistemics in social interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 20(1), 163-187.
- Heinemann, T. & Traverso, V. (2009). Complaining in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(12), 2381–2384.
- Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1–29.

Dialogicity and epistemics in formal individual discourse - Resources of interactional validation and confirmation in Andean Spanish and Quechua.

Philipp Dankel¹, Soto Rodriguez Mario²

¹University of Basel, Switzerland; ²Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg i.Br.

The frequent use of markers that have developed evidential and epistemic value has been noted early on in the study of Andean Spanish (e.g. Kany 1944). But the focus has almost always been on a monological perspective that focuses on the description of their grammatical value in comparison with the Quechua model within the framework of contact induced language change. The starting point for these comparisons, mostly where Quechua grammars following the concept of traditional grammatography. These models only feature those modal-epistemic values that are clearly grammaticalized. Only in recent years, however, several works have emphasized the dialogical character of these markers and their function in discourse, be it in Quechua or Andean Spanish. Pioneering works such as those of Mannheim (1986), for example, account for the conversational-dialogical character of Quechua narratives and place it in a fundamentally different cultural model. At the same time, research in conversational analysis has accounted for the fact that, even without grammatical markers, epistemicity and the negotiation of territories of information (Kamio 1997) might be the “engine” (Heritage 2012) for the progressivity of conversational interaction. However, this research has mainly been done for English or other SAE-languages and has scarcely been applied to other cultural contexts and discourse traditions. An examination of the precise workings of “epistemic engine” in a broader scope of varieties and cultures is an anticipated desideratum.

In this contribution, we take up an interactional approach to the investigation of Andean Spanish and Quechua as a contact varieties and analyze discursive resources of interactional validation and confirmation from situations of individual speech in formal or distant contexts (e.g., instructional discourse). We show that both varieties have established similarly working sequential patterns, driven by the same cultural background. These systematic patterns reflect a concept of negotiation of epistemic authority that is substantially different from the patterns described for European languages. We also show, that the sequential configuration described is deeply rooted in Andean culture and its preference for the construction of a dialogic discursive continuity in social interaction.

Cited Bibliography:

- Kamio, Akio (1997): *Territory of Information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kany, Charles E. (1944): "Impersonal *dizque* and Its Variants in American Spanish". In: *Hispanic Review* 12(2), 168-177.
- Heritage, John (2012): "The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge". In: *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1), 30-52.
- Mannheim, Bruce (1986): "The language of reciprocity in southern Peruvian Quechua". In: *Anthropological Linguistics* 28, 267-273.

“E lui me fa...”. Accessi evidenziali e posizioni epistemiche nei Discorsi Diretti Riportati in sequenze di troubles telling in lingua italiana

Ilaria Riccioni, Ramona Bongelli, Andrzej Zuczkowski

University of Macerata, Italy

Diversi studi hanno posto l'accento sulla funzione del Discorso Diretto Riportato (DDR) come *marker* evidenziale (Holt, 1996; Clift, 2006, 2007), spesso orientato a rafforzare la credibilità di chi lo produce (Sakita, 2002; Galatolo, 2007; Wooffitt, 2007; Ingridis & Aronsson, 2014), con l'intento di riferire nel *qui e ora*, in modo “oggettivo” – quanto fallace (Tannen, 1989; Clark & Gerrig, 1990; Calaresu, 2004) – , qualcosa accaduto *là e allora*. Come sappiamo che questa non è l'unica funzione del DDR nelle conversazioni, così risulta acquisito il fatto che le citazioni della “parola d'altri” (Mortara Garavelli, 1985) non sempre rappresentano dei discorsi propriamente “riportati”, ma possono più spesso caratterizzarsi come “costruiti”, “rappresentati”, “fittivi”, “immaginati” (Tannen, 1989; Myers, 1999; Calaresu, 2004; Haakana, 2007; Sams, 2010; Ferreira, 2020).

Il presente contributo mira ad analizzare i riferimenti agli accessi evidenziali (Willett, 1988) e alle posizioni epistemiche (Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Sidnell, 2012; Zuczkowski et al., 2021) assunte dal locutore nei DDR presenti in un corpus di parlato spontaneo riferibile all'attività conversazionale del *troubles telling* (Jefferson & Lee, 1981/1992; Jefferson, 2015, ed. by Drew et al.). Questo tipo di sequenze ci sembra particolarmente interessante per studiare il fenomeno del DDR, dal momento che il “parlare di problemi” normalmente si accompagna ad attività quali la narrazione e il *complaining*, che per loro stessa natura tendono ad includere citazioni di diversa natura.

Il corpus è costituito da 10 conversazioni tra amici (giovani adulti, parlanti nativi italiani), caratterizzate dalla condivisione di uno stesso focus: un problema di natura romantica. L'analisi, prevalentemente qualitativa, è stata condotta sulle stringhe di DDR considerando, tra i parametri, l'accesso evidenziale (riferito sia all'enunciazione in atto sia a quella citata; sia esplicito sia implicito; sia diretto che indiretto) e la posizione epistemica veicolata dal locutore. I principali risultati mostrano che, sebbene la maggior parte dei DDR siano riferiti ad un ricordo (nel *qui e ora*) di qualcosa che è stato ascoltato o detto (*là e allora*), accompagnati da evidenziali citativi (o cornici), riconducibili ad una evidenza diretta (o di prima mano) e a qualcosa di conosciuto, noto al locutore, non mancano esempi di natura diversa. Si rilevano, infatti, casi, non solo privi di indizi citazionali espliciti, ma in cui l'accesso all'informazione comunicata si basa sull'immaginazione ed è dunque indiretto (inferito) e la posizione epistemica assunta dal locutore è legata in modi diversi all'ambito della credenza.

La ricerca si inserisce all'interno di uno studio più ampio, volto ad indagare forme e funzioni pragmatiche del DDR nel contesto delle sequenze di *troubles telling*, e mira a fornire un contributo alla (non vastissima ad oggi) letteratura sul tema basata su corpora in lingua italiana.

“Non so”, “Non so se”, “Non ricordo”, “Non ricordo se”, “Boh”. Quando manca la fonte della conoscenza: l'uso degli epistemic disclaimers in un corpus di consultazioni ginecologiche in gravidanza.

Ramona Bongelli, Ilaria Riccioni, Zuczkowski Andrzej

University of Macerata, Italy

Le consultazioni ginecologiche in gravidanza costituiscono una particolare tipologia di interazioni medico-paziente che, al pari di altre, hanno luogo tra soggetti con differenti diritti epistemiche, priorità e autorità conoscitive rispetto a specifici contenuti (Lindström & Karlsson 2016, Menichetti et al. 2021): una donna incinta, che ha diritti, priorità e autorità sulle proprie esperienze relative alla gravidanza (stati emotivi, percezioni fisiche etc.), in modo simile a come in altri contesti altri/e pazienti hanno diritti, autorità e priorità sui propri sintomi e/o esperienze di sofferenza legate a una malattia; un/a ginecologo/a che, analogamente ad altri medici, ha diritti, autorità e priorità su contenuti connessi alle sue competenze medico-professionali (Lindström & Karlsson 2016). La nostra **ipotesi** è che, anche in virtù dello specifico contesto conversazionale, in cui vengono, di norma, affrontati argomenti altamente sensibili (come la scelta di effettuare oppure no un test di diagnosi prenatale) e discussi eventi largamente imprevedibili (ad esempio, il parto o la salute del nascituro), sia il medico-ginecologo/a sia la paziente ricorrono all'uso di espressioni di incertezza o di non conoscenza (*epistemic disclaimers*). Sebbene siano stati svolti numerosi lavori sulla gestione epistemica nelle interazioni medico-paziente (e.g., Heritage e Maynard 2006; Robinsons e Heritage 2014; Robinson et al. 2014, 2016), poco è stato scritto specificamente sulle consultazioni ginecologiche (Fatigante e Bafaro 2014; Landmark et al. 2015) e ancor meno sull'uso dei disclaimers epistemiche (Lindström et al. 2016). Per far luce su questo argomento, e testare la nostra ipotesi, abbiamo quindi analizzato con un **metodo** quali-quantitativo un corpus di 12 interazioni. L'analisi è stata effettuata secondo una **prospettiva teorica** che distingue tre posizioni epistemiche-evidenziali: la conoscenza/certezza, la credenza/incertezza e la non conoscenza/ignoranza. I principali **risultati** dell'analisi hanno evidenziato un uso differente dei disclaimers epistemiche sia in termini quantitativi (le pazienti ne usano più dei medici) sia qualitativi (le pazienti usano più espressioni di non conoscenza in turni non responsivi). Per quanto concerne i contenuti, sebbene le pazienti descrivano in termini di conoscenza e certezza le proprie esperienze interne, nei confronti delle quali hanno un accesso conoscitivo diretto (e.g., Willett 1988, Kamio 1995), tuttavia, si dichiarano spesso incapaci di accedere conoscitivamente alle cause di tali vissuti, che vengono pertanto comunicate come ignote (o incerte). Il medico, da parte sua, usa disclaimers epistemiche riferendosi principalmente a questioni che riguardano altri/e (i/le colleghi/e, di cui ignora le ragioni che muovono o hanno mosso un comportamento), altro (questioni pratico-organizzative sulle quali non ha un controllo diretto) o le pazienti (di cui ignora o non conosce con certezza le convinzioni etiche, che possono guidare la scelta di sottoporsi a un test di diagnosi prenatale oppure di evitarlo). Questi risultati, che sembrano in linea con le aspettative connesse ai ruoli, ai diritti epistemiche, alle priorità e autorità conoscitive degli interlocutori rispetto a specifici contenuti, spiegherebbero perché l'uso delle dichiarazioni di non conoscenza o conoscenza limitata non hanno generato particolari problematicità conversazionali nelle interazioni analizzate.

“Predicting” the common ground in talk-in-interaction. The example of sp. *se sabe (que)* (‘it is known (that)’)

Anja Hennemann

University of Potsdam, Germany

When at least two participants who coordinate their individual (verbal) actions are involved in a talk-in-interaction, one speaks about a joint activity (Clark 1996). One requisite of a joint activity is that the participants must possess some kind of shared knowledge, also called *common ground* [CG] (Stalnaker 2002). This CG of the two participants represents the “presumed background information shared by participants in a conversation” (Stalnaker 2002:701), i.e., the participants’ mutual assumptions and beliefs.

The CG as a communicative model should be seen as continuous development in the knowledge of the participants in a talk-in-interaction. It should be distinguished between CG content and CG management (Enfield 2008). The shared CG content represents known information as the sum of the knowledge evoked in a sentence that the speaker assumes is already present in the mind of the addressee at the moment of enunciation. The CG is managed/negotiated, in turn, when new information is added to that knowledge by the enunciation itself. In the following example, the speaker evokes the CG, marking the transmitted information epistemically/evidentially as a commonly known fact:

Inf.b. -...parecido a lo nuestro, averiguar y conversar sobre eso.

Inf.a. -Sí; el problema de... del... del profesional que emigra es bien complejo ¿ah? En general, **se sabe que** la mayor parte de la gente que se ha ido, anhela volver.

‘Inf.b. -...similar to ours, to find out and talk about it.

Inf.a. -Yes; the problem of... of... of the professional who emigrates is quite complex, huh? In general, **it is known that** most of the people who have left, long to return’

By using *se sabe (que)* the speaker presupposes a shared access to the source of knowledge (private vs. shared access; Wachtmeister 2005), but not necessarily with the direct interlocutor. However, this leads us to the notion of intersubjectivity (Cornillie 2016:229). From the interlocutor’s/addressee’s perspective, a speaker’s utterance can be accepted, thus being added to the shared knowledge or it can be questioned/disputed.

In a qualitative corpus analysis, adjacency pairs containing *se sabe (que)* – or a variant such as *ya se sabe (que)* ‘it is already known (that)’ – is studied by means of transcribed oral data from the *Corpus del Español* (CdP) and the *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual* (CREA). The construction is described as an evidential strategy and it is asked: a) which pragmatic implications are transmitted and b) when/in which part of the interaction is the construction used?

CdP. Corpus del Español. <https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/>.

Clark, H. 1996. *Using language*. CUP.

Cornillie, B. 2016. “Las lecturas evidenciales de los verbos (semi)auxiliares en español”. In: R. González Ruiz/D. Izquierdo Alegría/O. Loureda Lamas (eds.). *La evidencialidad en español: teoría y descripción*. Iberoamericana Vervuert, 227-249.

CREA. Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual. <https://corpus.rae.es/creanet.html>.

Enfield, N. 2008. “Common ground as a resource for social affiliation”. In: I. Kecskes/J. Mey (eds.). *Intention, Common Ground and the Egocentric Speaker-Hearer*. DeGruyter, 223-54.

Stalnaker, R. 2002. “Common ground”. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25, 701-21.

Wachtmeister Bermúdez F. 2005. *Evidencialidad. La codificación lingüística del punto de vista*. su.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:199511/FULLTEXT01.

L'interiezione italo-romanza [ø] ('öh') in turni di risposta: oltre la semplice conferma

Franco Pauletto¹, Biagio Ursi²

¹Stockholms universitet, Stockholm (Sweden); ²ICAR Lab / CNRS, Lyon (France)

This conversation analytic study aims at describing the interactional uses of [ø] ('öh'), an interjection (Stivers 2019) commonly used in Italian and other Italo-Romance varieties. The study is based on a corpus of 53 instances of this phenomenon coming from informal phone calls between friends, face-to-face conversations and interviews in standard and regional Italian.

The analysis shows that [ø] appears in responsive turns both as a stand-alone particle and as a turn-preface. Two distinct prosodic profiles of [ø] correspond to different actions, which will be accounted for in our presentation: a descending-ascending profile (as an answer to polar questions and as a response token) and an ascending-descending profile (when prefacing assessments). In the case of answers to polar questions and when it is used as a response token, the [ø]-turn performs actions that go beyond confirmation, agreement and/or acknowledgement: from an epistemic point of view, it treats the topic under discussion as independently accessed and as a something that is assessable by the responder in a scalar fashion. Here is an example of polar question responded to with a stand-alone [ø]:

1) interviste stradali arcoiris.tv (min. 05.54) (IN = interviewer)

((P9 walks during the interview, topic is racism in Italy))

01 IN secondo lei c'è::?

do you think there is (racism)?

02 (0.3)

03 P9 ↓↑ö:::h! ((raises and lowers chin))

04 (0.7) ((P9 moves away))

05 (1.1) ((P9 turns to IN, nods, smiles))

In this excerpt a prototypical use of this interjection is observable: to the polar question of the interviewer (line 01), which projects “si” (‘yes’) or “no” (‘no’) as type-conforming answers (Raymond 2003) in the next turn, the passer-by answers affirmatively. However, she does not use the token “si” (‘yes’) as much as the interjection ‘öh’. Later on, while walking away, the speaker turns to the interviewer and produces a new, embodied answer.

Conversation Analysis (Schegloff 2007) provides the theoretical and methodological basis for this investigation. Data were collected between 2016 and 2021 and transcribed according to CA conventions (Jefferson 2004). In this paper, we examine the sequential organization of stretches of talk in which [ø]-prefaced turns, as well as turns consisting of a stand-alone [ø], are embedded, to highlight the type of social action performed by participants through this linguistic resource.

References

- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In G. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social actions*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G.H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68(6), 939–967.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in Conversation Analysis. Volume 1*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Stivers, T. (2019). How we manage social relationships through answers to questions: The case of interjections. *Discourse Processes*, 56(3), 191–209.

“Mi sa” come marker epistemico in relazione a “so”, “non so”, “non so se”, “credo”, “penso”

Andrzej Zuczkowski¹, Ramona Bongelli¹, Ilaria Riccioni¹, Roberto Burro²

¹University of Macerata, Italy; ²University of Verona, Italy

L'espressione impersonale MI SA, MI SA CHE... ha ricevuto scarsa attenzione in letteratura (Bozzone Costa 1991; Orletti 1995; D'Achille 2010). Il contributo più sistematico, anche se breve, è di Serianni (2012), il quale la considera “il modo più immediato e spontaneo per esprimere la propria opinione” nel parlato contemporaneo (ibidem, p. 18), dunque “un semplice sinonimo di *credo/penso* marcato dal registro più familiare” (ibidem, p.19) e da maggiori restrizioni morfologiche: il suo uso è infatti limitato all'io (*mi*) del parlante (**ti/vi sa; *gli/le/a loro/a Paolo sa*) e al tempo presente (**mi sapeva, *mi saprà* ecc.); anche la proposizione che tale espressione regge è normalmente all'indicativo, raramente al congiuntivo (ibidem, p. 19).

Dal punto di vista epistemico, MI SA sembra dunque caratterizzarsi come un modale comunicante una posizione di *credenza* del parlante, come appunto CREDO/PENSO.

Il nostro contributo riguarda una ricerca in corso che intende approfondire il lavoro di Serianni in una triplice direzione:

(1) L'analisi di Serianni (2012) si limita a corpora scritti, letterari e giornalistici. Quali e quante sono le occorrenze di MI SA, MI SA CHE... in un corpus di parlato contemporaneo?

(2) SO, NON SO, NON SO SE, MI SA: il secondo obiettivo del nostro studio è verificare quale sia per un campione di parlanti italiani la relazione tra MI SA e le altre espressioni modali che usano il verbo SAPERE alla prima persona del presente indicativo come SO, NON SO, NON SO SE. Intendiamo verificare dove si situa MI SA CHE...nel continuum epistemico che va dalla conoscenza/certezza (SO CHE...) alla non conoscenza/ignoranza (NON SO perché/dove/come/quando/che cosa/chi/quale...) passando attraverso l'incertezza (NON SO SE...).

(3) CREDO, PENSO, MI SA: il terzo obiettivo del nostro studio è verificare, all'interno dello specifico continuum epistemico della *credenza*, in che relazione sta MI SA con CREDO e PENSO, normalmente considerati, non solo da Serianni (2012), come suoi sinonimi. Il grado di credenza o di incertezza assegnato alle tre espressioni epistemiche da un campione di parlanti italiani è uguale o diverso? E se è diverso, le differenze sono statisticamente significative? In altri termini, nell'uso quotidiano le tre espressioni sono effettivamente sinonimiche?

Il quadro teorico di riferimento è un modello epistemico che distingue tre posizioni: la conoscenza/certezza, l'incertezza e la non conoscenza/ignoranza.

L'approccio adottato combina diverse metodologie di indagine. Per rispondere all'interrogativo (1), abbiamo effettuato l'analisi quantitativa e qualitativa dei corpora di parlato contemporaneo KIParla (Mauri et al. 2019) e ParlaTO (Cerruti, Ballarè 2021), principalmente al fine di individuare le caratteristiche grammaticali (soggetti, tempi e modi dei verbi) delle proposizioni rette da MI SA CHE e la posizione parentetica (mediana o finale) di MI SA.

Per raggiungere gli obiettivi (2) e (3), abbiamo somministrato un questionario a un campione di parlanti italiani in cui vengono messe a confronto 6 frasi costituite da una stessa proposizione introdotta di volta in volta da un'espressione modale differente: SO, NON SO, NON SO SE, MI SA, CREDO, PENSO. Al momento della stesura dell'abstract, i risultati del questionario sono in fase di elaborazione.

Challenging epistemic personhood: dismissive incomprehension

MANUEL PADILLA CRUZ

Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Epistemic personhood is “[...] the ability to author knowledge [...]” and involves “[...] having ontological standing as a knower” (Thorson and Baker 2019: 102) or source of knowledge. Highly contingent on *epistemic trustworthiness* (Fricker 2007), it is constructed, maintained or strengthened during our epistemic practices.

Research in pragmatics has extensively shown that a variety of linguistic elements enable presentation of individuals as *competent* and *trustworthy* informers: evidential adverbs, adverbials and participles, parenthetical expressions, hearsay adverbials, verbal mood or modal verbs (Ifantidou 1992, 1993, 2001; Wilson and Sperber 1993). These elements assist the *epistemic vigilance* mechanisms assessing the reliability and trustworthiness of information and informers (Sperber et al. 2010). Indeed, they convey information about the evidence available to informers and indicate their degree of commitment to the dispensed content (Aikhenvald 2004; Cornillie 2007; Nuyts 2006). Along with the informers' reputation or signals unveiling knowledge or ignorance, these elements are a valuable *source of trust* (Origgi 2013) contributing to epistemic trustworthiness.

However, little attention has been paid to verbal behaviours challenging or undermining epistemic personhood. One of them is known in social epistemology as *dismissive incomprehension* (Cull 2019). This consists of a (fake) expression of ignorance or non-understanding by a person who is considered an epistemic authority. It aims to present imparted information as absurd or meaningless in order to denigrate an informer in the eyes of an audience. After addressing the conditions for the successful expression of dismissive incomprehension and its devastating effects, this presentation will argue that research should focus on its dynamics. It will suggest that the spotlight should be put on the actual verbal actions accomplished when expressing it, the linguistic structures deployed, their assemblage into discourse sequences and the responses that it triggers. Thus, vulnerable epistemic agents will understand how dismissive incomprehension works and how it may be counteracted.

References

- Cull, Matthew J. 2019. Dismissive incomprehension: A use of purported ignorance to undermine others. *Social Epistemology. A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy* 33 (3): 262-271.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cornillie, Bert. 2007. *Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in Spanish (Semi-)Auxiliaries: A Cognitive-functional Approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fricker, Miranda. 2007. *Epistemic Injustice. Power & the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ifantidou, Elly. 1992. Sentential adverbs and relevance. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 4: 193-214.
- Ifantidou, Elly. Parentheticals and relevance. 1993. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 5: 193-210.
- Ifantidou, Elly. 2001. *Evidentials and Relevance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2006. Modality: Overview and linguistic issues. In *The Expression of Modality*, ed. by William Frawley, 1-26. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Origg, Gloria. 2013. Epistemic injustice and epistemic trust. *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy* 26 (2): 221-235.
- Sperber, Dan, Fabrice Clément, Christophe Heintz, Olivier Mascaro, Hugo Mercier, Gloria Origg and Deirdre Wilson. 2010. Epistemic Vigilance. *Mind and Language* 25 (4): 359-393.
- Thorson, Juli, and Christine Baker 2019. Venting as epistemic work. *Social Epistemology. A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy* 33 (2): 101-110.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1993. Linguistic form and relevance. *Lingua* 90 (1-2): 1-25.

The Brexit conundrum: Stancetaking in the discourse of political speeches and parliamentary debates

Juana I. Marín-Arrese

Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Stance resources may be said to index speaker/writers' epistemic, evaluative or effective positionings, and the intersubjective construction of identity in the discourse (Biber & Finegan 1989; Bucholtz and Hall 2005; Marín-Arrese 2011, 2015). This paper focuses on stance as the way we construct subject positions within interactional discourse contexts through the expression of justificatory support for the proposition (Boye 2012), epistemic stance, and through persuasive attitudes with respect to the realization of events, effective stance. The framework for the analysis of stance posits two macro categories, the epistemic and the effective (Marín-Arrese 2011), which reflect the systematic opposition in discourse between striving for control of conceptions of reality and striving for control of relations at the level of reality (cf. Langacker 2013).

The paper explores the deployment of epistemic and of effective stance expressions in parliamentary debates and political speeches, and more specifically in the discourse of the key actors in the Brexit process: Theresa May and Boris Johnson. From a critical discourse perspective, it will be argued that the interplay of these resources serves the strategic functions of legitimisation and coercion, that is, support for the validity of the communicated information and persuasive intent regarding preferred events and action goals (Van Dijk 2003; Chilton 2004; Marín-Arrese 2011, 2015).

The paper addresses the following issues: (a) variation in the deployment of epistemic and effective stance markers in the discourse of the key actors in the Brexit process, May vs. Johnson; (b) variation in the use of stancetaking markers in two genres of political discourse, debates vs. speeches; (c) the role of stancetaking as legitimisation and (de)legitimisation strategies and in identity construction.

The paper presents results of corpus study on the discourse stance of key political actors in the UK Conservative party, Theresa May and Boris Johnson, during the Brexit process. The adhoc corpus comprises extracts from parliamentary debates and political speeches, during the period 2016-2020.

References

- Biber, Douglas and Finegan, Edward. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text*, 1: 93-124.
- Bucholtz, Mary and Hall, Kira. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4/5): 585-614.
- Chilton, Paul. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*. London, Routledge.
- DuBois, John W. (2007). The stance triangle. In Englebretson, Robert (ed) *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 139-182.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2013). Modals: Striving for Control. In: Marín-Arrese, J.I.; Carretero, M.; Arús, J. and van der Auwera, J. (Eds.) *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter. 3-55.
- Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (2011). Effective vs. Epistemic stance and Subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (ed.), *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 193-224.
- Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (2015). Epistemic Legitimation and Inter/Subjectivity in the Discourse of Parliamentary and Public Inquiries: A contrastive case study. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 12 (3): 261-278.
- Van Dijk, Teun. (2003). Knowledge in parliamentary debates. *Journal of Language and Politics* 2 (1): 93-129.

The evidential dimension of assessments

Johanna Miecznikowski

Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland

Assessments are actions whose main function is to situate a referent or state of affairs on some axiological scale. Assessments rise problems when it comes to their relation with knowledge. In linguistics, «epistemic discourse» has been sharply distinguished from «appreciative» and «axiological» discourse (Pietrandrea 2018:174), in line with a tradition that studies distinct categories of grammatical and lexical modal markers. In Conversation Analysis, on the other hand, it has been observed that «with an assessment, a speaker claims knowledge of that which he or she is assessing» (Pomerantz 1984:57), knowledge that gives him/her «primary rights to evaluate the matter assessed» (Heritage/Raymond 2005:16).

The present contribution discusses these problems with special attention to distinctions between different types of sources of/access to knowledge. It is based on a collection of assessments taken from a video-recorded corpus of spoken Italian that includes situations of collaborative cooking and table conversations.

Frequent assessment formats in the data are: non lexical vocalizations (liminal signs, Dingemanse 2020), invocations and swear words with affective prosody/ facial expressions, exclamations with *che* and *quanto*+axiological predicate, copula/raising verbs (e.g. *essere* 'to be', *trovare* 'to find')+axiological predicate, verbs of (dis)liking (e.g. *mi piace* 'I like', *fare schifo* 'to be disgusting'). Assessments recurrently function as noticing (Schegloff 2007:219), back-channels, answers to assessment requests, second assessments (Pomerantz 1984), conclusions of narratives, comments during an activity of reviewing (movies, kinds of food etc.), arguments in certain kinds of discussions (e.g. when evaluating options in decision-making).

The kind of knowledge participants possess about the assessed referent/SoA appears to be interactionally relevant: (a) evidential indeterminacy is rare, i.e. the type of access to the referent/SoA (in order of frequency: direct experience, others' discourse, inference) is situationally evident or specified verbally; (b) verbal evidential strategies tend to precede assessments or to co-occur with them, assuming a framing function; (c) the speaker's and recipient's knowledge sources are negotiated by practices such as repair and epistemic down/upgrading. In addition, (d) many assessments are accompanied by (mostly postponed) accounts, pointing towards further aspects of the participants' evaluative competence, e.g. regarding parameters of judgment or the comparison with similar cases.

The results show that the availability and typification of knowledge plays an important role in the formation of assessments. They invite to study the specific linguistic and sequential characteristics of evidential resources in assessments, which partly differ from those used to back up axiologically (more) neutral informings and confirmation requests.

Dingemanse, M., 2020. Between Sound and Speech: Liminal Signs in Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 53(1):188-196.

Heritage, J./Raymond, G.T., 2005. The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1):15-38.

Pietrandrea, P., 2018. Epistemic constructions at work. A corpus study on spoken Italian dialogues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 128:171-191.

Pomerantz, A., 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: J.M. Atkinson, ed, *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge:CUP, 57-101.

Schegloff, E., 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*, vol. 1, Cambridge:CUP.

The argumentative establishment of knowledge in antenatal care consultations

Kati Hannken-Illjes

Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany

This talk analyzes the interactional establishment of common ground through argumentation in antenatal care consultations. Pregnancy and birth are themes that evoke different normative discourses, as for instance of what a good birth should be like (Villa, Moebius, Thiessen 2011). The conversations under consideration combine anamnestic practices with explanatory and counseling talk. They function to convey information to the midwife, give orientation to all participants by addressing different themes that can become relevant during the birth and at the same time to establish trust (removed for blind review).

As other types of medical conversations, antenatal care consultations are characterized by an epistemic asymmetry. The midwife – and/or doctor – holds professional, categorical and medical knowledge (Spranz-Fogasy 2010) whereas the pregnant woman has non-professional as well as experiential knowledge, also about former pregnancies and births. Next to question and answer sequences, explanatory sequences and narrating, argumentation functions as a means to work on this asymmetry. Argumentation in medical consultations has been linked to the establishment of common ground (see Bigi 2018) as well as to the procedure of shared or joint decision making (Koerfer / Albus 2015). This paper will focus on how in antenatal care consultations common ground is established through the material topoi pregnant women and midwives take up in the talk as material topoi reflect and actualize what participants take to be common ground and shared knowledge (see Knoblauch 2000).

The analysis is grounded in a corpus of 37 videotaped antenatal care consultations in a German university hospital, ranging from 10 to 60 minutes. The data has been transcribed according to GAT 2 conventions (Selting et al. 2011). Methodologically the paper follows an integration of conversation analysis and argumentation analysis and addresses material topoi as individually or collectively actualized resources of argumentation (see among others Schwarze 2010).

Bigi, S. (2018). The role of argumentative strategies in the construction of emergent common ground in a patient-centered approach to the medical encounter. *Journal of Argumentation in Context*, 7(2), 141-156. doi:https://doi.org/10.1075/jaic.18028.big

Knoblauch, H. (2000). Topik und Soziologie. Von der sozialen zur kommunikativen Topik. In T. Schirren & G. Ueding (Eds.), *Topik und Rhetorik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 652-667.

Koerfer, A., & Albus, C. (2015). Dialogische Entscheidungsfindung zwischen Arzt und Patient. In A. Busch & T. Spranz-Fogasy (Eds.), *Handbuch Sprache in der Medizin*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 116-134.

Schwarze, C. (2010). *Formen und Funktionen von Topoi im Gespräch*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Selting, M., Auer, P., Barth-Weingarten, D., Bergmann, J., Bergmann, P., Birkner, K., . . . Uhmann, S. (2009). Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 10, 353-402.

Villa, P., Moebius, S. & Thiessen, B. (2011). *Soziologie der Geburt: Diskurse, Praktiken und Perspektiven – Einführung*. Frankfurt: Campus, 7-20.

Spranz-Fogasy, T. (2010): Verstehensdokumentation in der medizinischen Kommunikation: Fragen und Antworten im Arzt-Patient-Gespräch. In: Deppermann, Arnulf; Reitemeier, Ulrich; Schmitt, Reinhold; Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas: Verstehen in professionellen Handlungsfeldern, Tübingen. Gunter Narr Verlag, 27-116.

Relocating as a therapeutic resource in psychodynamic psychotherapy

Carolina Fenner

Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Germany

Resistance is a central concept in psychotherapy and comprises the forces prevailing in the patient that are directed against the progress of the therapy (Greenson 2007, p. 71). On the one hand, the patient wants to change his or her life with the help of the therapy. On the other hand, there is a desire - usually unconscious - to maintain the status quo out of fear of change (Storck 2021, p. 28). Resistance is thus a valuable indicator of underlying significant experiences of the patient (Messer 2002, p. 158f.).

Language is considered to be the central therapeutic medium in psychotherapy, also referred to as "the talking cure" (Freud 1910, p. 13). Nevertheless, linguistic studies of resistance phenomena and their processing by therapists are rare (but see Muntigl 2013).

In an interdisciplinary project between Heidelberg University Hospital and the Institute for the German Language in Mannheim, the manifestation and interactional management of resistance in psychodynamic therapy sessions is investigated using conversation analysis and quantitative methods. The underlying data consist of 34 video-recorded psychodynamic therapy sessions in German of 30 patients.

One form of resistance management found several times in the data examined is the therapist's relocating of a topic already covered earlier in the therapy or the current session, so-called 'relocating formulations' (Weiste and Peräkylä 2013, p. 311): The therapist (T) brings up the previously shared knowledge in order to handle the patient's resistance as shown in the following example. At the beginning of the session, the patient (P) is thinking about a stay in a day clinic. About half an hour later, P reports that she is very preoccupied with herself and others and starts recounting a conversation with her doctor, who initially advised her to a day clinic stay. In the following excerpt (English translation only), T requests for concretization. P shows resistance by not remembering and not answering the question, which stops the narration. After several pauses and stuttering from P, T takes over the right to speak by using a relocating formulation as resistance management: The day clinic might also be a solution for the problem P has just reported. P finally agrees to T's suggestion.

01 T: what (did he think)

02 P: °h something um

03 (.) I can no longer tell you exactly

((7 lines of pauses and stuttering by P removed))

11 P: °hh yeah (.) <<groaning> hh° >

12 (11.8)

13 T: the day clinic might be [a bit of a possibility]

14 P: [°hhh h]h°

15 T: escape from it all a little bit [too]

16 P: [h°]

17 (0.29)

18 P: °h yes yes (-) yes of course

The talk will answer the following questions: How is the previous topic made relevant to the current situation by the therapist? What is the function of relocating formulations? The aim of the investigation is to determine whether the form of resistance management considered can lead to a progression conducive to the goals of the therapy.

Evidentiality in obstetrics: Topic initiation and embedded references to knowledge sources

Ina Völker

Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany

Conversation analysis has demonstrated that speaker's attitude towards knowledge, the (un)certainly of information and the source of knowledge effect the structure of their utterances and more generally the way in which they build turns, actions and sequences (Mondada 2013:598). Speakers implicate these linguistic features to accomplish epistemic positioning in interaction, especially when communicative asymmetries are involved (Sidnell 2012:315). Research on physician-patient interactions has shown that investigations in this field can provide information about connections between forms of utterances and embedded aspects of knowledge (e.g. Deppermann & Spranz-Fogasy 2011). One medical area that has received little attention in this regard is obstetrics. This is surprising, since obstetrics operates with highly emotional and sensitive issues for which a sufficient and precise flow of knowledge seems relevant. Reference to sources of knowledge in particular may provide insights into prior knowledge, conditions and access to the uttered information of the pregnant women.

My presentation addresses communicative practices between pregnant women and midwives within antenatal conversations in the last trimester of pregnancy in an obstetric ward. The data is drawn from a corpus of 37 video-recordings of conversations which vary in length from 10 to 60 minutes and are fully transcribed (GAT 2). They include an anamnestic phase and one less thematically restricted, addressing questions and wishes concerning the birth. Employing a Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics informed method, I will argue that participants use displays of knowledge sources in order to present their information requests or wishes for the birth as justified concerns and to position themselves as more or less knowing. Hence, I will focus on the action of 'topic initiation' and its connection with evidentiality: I will show that differences in topic initiation between primigravidas and multigravidas can be traced back to different accesses to knowledge, i.e. Type 1 vs. Type 2 knowables (Pomerantz 1980). Primigravidas often refer to mediated knowledge (e.g. from friends, the internet or gynaecologists) about birth processes in order to emphasize their status as 'not knowing' and to 'fish for' information in an implicit manner. In contrast, multigravidas often draw on experiences of the previous birth when asking questions or expressing wishes about the imminent delivery and thus simultaneously provide a justification for their topic initiations.

The presentation will address the following questions:

1.) In how far can (different) formations of topic initiations reveal information about (different) sources of knowledge in obstetric conversations?

2.) Which lexical markers index an orientation of the participants to evidentiality in conversations between midwives and pregnant woman?

References:

- Deppermann, Arnulf; Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas (2011): Doctors' Questions as Displays of Understanding. In: *CAM* 8(2): 111-122.
- Mondada, Lorenza (2013): Displaying, contesting and negotiating epistemic authority in social interaction: Descriptions and questions in guided visits. In: *Discourse Studies* 15(5): 597-626.
- Pomerantz, Anita (1980): Telling My Side: "Limited Access" as a "Fishing" Device. In: *Sociological Inquiry* 50(3-4): 186-198.
- Sidnell, Jack (2012): Who knows best?: Evidentiality and epistemic asymmetry in conversation. In: *Pragmatics and Society* 3(3): 294-320.

Projection component e liste nell'espressione della fonte di conoscenza

Roberta Cicchirillo

University of Salerno, Italy

Il presente contributo, attraverso una metodologia *corpus-based*, ha l'obiettivo di individuare, qualitativamente e quantitativamente, la presenza di strategie evidenziali dirette (1), riportate (2) e inferite (3) (Willet 1988), veicolate dall'elemento *projection component* all'interno delle costruzioni a lista, negli esempi in neretto. In base alla definizione di Masini et al. (2018), le liste sono una combinazione simmetrica di due o più unità sintattiche dello stesso tipo all'interno di una struttura più ampia. Le porzioni esterne circostanti, tramite operazioni di proiezione, (negli esempi **PRO-C**), allacciano rapporti con le strutture a lista (**LISTA**) creando una coesione discorsiva per cui un *preliminary materials* (Schegloff 1980) prefigura un evento successivo e si proietta, su un'azione contestuale. In questo senso, il *projection* può fungere da strategia evidenziale per esprimere il tipo e la modalità di accesso alla fonte di conoscenza, mettendo in risalto elementi contestuali, legati a "degli antefatti dell'atto assertivo" (Miecznikowski 2017:1).

(1) anche ai cambiamenti emotivi che diciamo ninni attraverso nella sua vita [prima lo vediamo appunto bambino, tra l'altro, il romanzo è diviso proprio in tre macroparti]_{PRO-C}

[il bambino il ragazzino e il ragazzo]_{LISTA}

[RadioCast]

(2) [ci stavano spiegando prima]_{PRO-C}

[degli addetti ai lavori qua degli accompagnatori degli artisti e dei discografici]_{LISTA}

nettamente più alta rispetto a quella che ha votato martedì

[LIR]

(3) [così il padre diceva di questa milano dell'illuminismo perché intendeva dire]_{PRO-C}

[la modernità l'industria la fabbrica eheh diciamo l'organizzazione del lavoro anche la meritocrazia]_{LISTA}

[RadioCast]

Il presente studio, utilizzando corpora di parlato radiofonico, LIR (Maraschio et al. 1997) e RadioCast (Masini et al. 2020), prenderà in esame circa 60 costruzioni a lista contenenti *projection* e in base alla classificazione di Willet (1988) cercherà di comprendere la modalità attraverso cui i parlanti esprimono l'accesso alla conoscenza, in rapporto al tipo di funzione che la lista manifesta. In virtù della sequenzialità retrospettiva, l'obiettivo ultimo dello studio sarà pertanto capire se la struttura discorsiva che tiene insieme *projection* e lista, possa fungere da strategia evidenziale per esprimere l'accesso alla conoscenza e in quali contesti strutturali e funzionali ciò si verifica.

Masini, Francesca, Caterina Mauri & Paola Pietrandrea (2018), List constructions: Towards a unified account. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 30, 49-94.

Maraschio, Nicoletta, Anna Antonini, Patrizia Bellucci, Massimo Fanfani, Stefania Stefanelli, Cinzia Avesani, & Monica Pratesi (1997), Il progetto LIR. I lessici di frequenza dell'italiano radiofonico. *Bollettino d'informazioni* VII(1-2), 53-94.

Masini, Francesca, Silvia Ballarè, & Roberta C. Combei (2020), *Verso la creazione di un nuovo corpus di italiano della radio e dei podcast*. Talk given at CLUB DAY "Parola al parlato", University of Bologna, 1 October 2020.

Willet, T (1988), A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticization of Evidentiality. *Studies in Language*, 12(1), 51-97.

Schegloff, E.A (1980), Preliminaries to preliminaries: "Can I ask you a question". *Sociological Inquiry*, vol. 50, no. 3-4, 104-152.

Miecznikowski, J. (2017) Predicati di percezione ed evidenzialità in italiano: l'esempio di impressione. *Linguisti in contatto* II. Atti convegno, Bellinzona, 19-21 novembre 2015. Osservatorio linguistico della Svizzera italiana, 242-259.

Il futuro epistemico e il futuro concessivo: italiano d'Italia e di Svizzera a confronto

Laura Baranzini

OLSI, USI, Switzerland

In questo contributo intendiamo confrontare una strategia epistemico-evidenziale di tipo morfologico, ovvero il futuro non temporale dell'italiano, all'interno di due corpora relativi a due diverse varietà geografiche di italiano.

Diversi studi sono stati dedicati, negli ultimi decenni, al futuro epistemico dell'italiano (fra i molti Bertinetto 1979, Rocci 2000, Baranzini 2017) e al futuro concessivo (per es. Berretta 1997, Squartini 2012, Baranzini & Mari 2019), illustrati in (1) e (2):

1) Sento dei rumori: Giovanni *sarà* tornato.

2) *Sarà* un professore, ma mi sembra che dica solo banalità.

Il futuro non temporale dell'italiano è stato analizzato tanto in prospettiva epistemica, quale modalizzatore del grado di certezza attribuito dal locutore allo stato di cose espresso nella proposizione, quanto evidenziale, come indicatore del *mode of knowing*, o – in particolare per il futuro concessivo – mettendo in luce la possibilità di questo strumento morfologico di segnalare la non adesione del locutore al contenuto espresso e quindi l'attribuzione ad "altri" di esso.

Sulla base di quest'ultima caratterizzazione osserveremo come questa strategia viene sfruttata all'interno di un corpus di italiano parlato della Svizzera italiana (LIPSI, Pandolfi 2009) e un corpus di italiano parlato d'Italia (LIP, Banca dati dell'italiano parlato), con l'obiettivo di raccogliere alcuni dati preliminari su diffusione e funzioni e di descrivere eventuali somiglianze o divergenze tra queste due varianti di italiano.

Per esempio, sarà possibile indagare la pertinenza, a livello di interfaccia morfologia-pragmatica, di alcuni tratti relativi alla variante svizzera, come quello della sua maggiore vicinanza con il francese e il tedesco (tipicamente riscontrata a livello lessicale) rispetto allo standard d'Italia; gli usi non temporali del futuro, infatti, sono meno produttivi in francese e in tedesco per quanto riguarda il futuro epistemico, e assenti in costruzione concessiva (dove la stessa funzione è svolta da avverbi o verbi modali).

L'analisi avrà quindi un duplice intento: studiare le realizzazioni nel parlato del futuro non temporale quale strumento di gestione e di espressione della fonte dell'informazione e, allo stesso tempo, indagare eventuali differenze meno superficiali (rispetto al lessico) fra le due varietà nazionali di italiano.

Baranzini, Laura & Mari, Alda (2019). From epistemic modality to concessivity: Alternatives and pragmatic reasoning *per absurdum*. *Journal of pragmatics* 142: 116-138.

Baranzini, Laura (2017). Les modalités du futur en italien. In Baranzini, L. (ed.), *Le futur dans les langues romanes*. Bern, Lang: 169-198.

Berretta, Monica (1997). Sul futuro concessivo: riflessioni su un caso (dubbio) di de/grammaticalizzazione. *Linguistica e filologia* 5: 7-40.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco (1979). Alcune ipotesi sul nostro futuro (con osservazioni su *potere* e *dovere*). *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 4: 77-138.

LIP, Banca dati dell'italiano parlato, badip.uni-graz.at/it/corpus-lip

Pandolfi, Elena Maria (2009). LIPSI. Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato nella Svizzera italiana. Bellinzona, OLSI.

Rocci, Andrea (2000). L'interprétation épistémique du future en italien et en français: une analyse procédurale. *Cahiers de linguistique française* 22: 241-274.

Squartini, Mario (2012). Evidentiality in interaction: The concessive use of the Italian future between grammar and discourse. *Journal of pragmatics* 44: 2116-2128.

Who knows what in the communication process: evidential strategies and grammatical marking after *verba dicendi* in Bulgarian

Ekaterina Tarpomanova, Krasimira Aleksova, Bilyana Mihaylova

Sofia University, Bulgaria

Bulgarian is one of the few Indo-European languages with a grammaticalized evidentiality. In the typological study of Aikhenvald it is classified as A1 type, i.e. direct (firsthand) vs. indirect (non-firsthand) information (Aikhenvald 2004: 288). This classification is well-grounded considering the fact that the indicative mood is marked for direct evidentiality. Using an indicative tense, the speaker presents the events as acquired directly (witnessed) or as belonging to his/her strong knowledge (Nitsolova 2008: 334-336). On the other hand, there are three indirect evidentials that emerged from the perfect tense and further developed a temporal paradigm (Gerdzhikov 2003: 207-221), each of them having a morphological marker: the reported is marked by the omission of the auxiliary 'be' in the 3rd person, the inferential by the presence of the auxiliary 'be', and the dubitative has an additional auxiliary (the reported form of 'be') in all persons and numbers.

This study explores the interaction between the participants in the communication process with respect to their knowledge about the situation presented in the utterance when transforming direct into indirect speech using a *verbum dicendi*. The speaker has a choice between several indicative tenses which by definition should denote a witnessed situation and the indirect evidentials which present the situation as non-witnessed. The interplay between the grammatical marking and the speaker's evidential strategy will be analysed by applying a corpus method. The data of the Bulgarian National Corpus (cf. Koeva et al. 2012) will be used to detect the preferences for a given strategy considering also the grammatical person which indicates the level of knowledge of the participants in the communication about the situation: the 1st person shows the strong knowledge of the speaker, the 2nd person is related to the strong knowledge of the listener, and the 3rd person is associated with a weak knowledge of both participants. Illustrative examples representative for a given situation will be extracted from the corpus and will be subjected to a context analysis.

References

Aikhenvald 2004: Aikhenvald, A. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gerdzhikov 2003: Герджиков, Г. 2003. *Преизказването на глаголното действие в българския език*. София: Университетско издателство "Св. Климент Охридски".

Koeva et al. 2012: Koeva, S., I. Stoyanova, S. Leseva, Ts. Dimitrova, R. Dekova, E. Tarpomanova. The Bulgarian National Corpus: Theory and Practice in Corpus Design. – *Journal of Language Modelling*, Vol. 0, No 1 (2012), pp. 65-110.

Nitsolova 2008: Ницолова, Р. *Българска граматика. Морфология*. София: Университетско издателство "Св. Климент Охридски".

Evidentiality between syntax and discourse: a case study in spoken Italian

Silvia Ballarè, Caterina Mauri

University of Bologna, Italy

The aim of this paper is to analyze the discursive functions conveyed by verbs belonging to the class of *verba putandi* at the 1sg followed by a completive clause with indicative mood, see (1) and (2).

(1) *Penso che può essere utile* (I think that it can be useful)

(2) *Credo che forse ci sono più persone che si muovono* (I believe that maybe there are more people travelling)

In Standard Italian, *verba putandi* require a completive clause with subjunctive or indicative mood. According to traditional grammars (Serianni 2010 [1989] § XIV, 48), mood selection depends on the “degree of certainty” that the speaker wants to express over the propositional content contained in the completive clause. Furthermore, it is well-known that the subjunctive/indicative alternation correlates with sociolinguistic factors, such as the degree of formality of the interaction and the speaker’s social characterization.

In this paper, we suggest that these two aspects do not tell the whole story. In particular, following Sbisà (2014, see also Thompson & Mulac 1991 and Apothéloz 2003), we argue that utterances like (1) and (2) mainly provide assertions, whereby the speaker indicates her knowledge/opinion as the source of information: the use of the indicative mood may be a consequence of a different construction/mental representation of the main clause, which is not perceived as such, but rather as an evidential or epistemic marker followed by a fully-fledged assertion, expressed by an indicative mood (cf. as in *secondo me, è arrivato* ‘to me, he is arrived’).

In order to verify this hypothesis, we will examine all the occurrences of *penso che* (I think that), *credo che* (I believe that), *trovo che* (I find that) and *ho l'impressione che* (I have the impression that) + indicative in the KIParla Corpus (kiparla.it) and the RadioCast-it Corpus (site.unibo.it/radiocast), amounting to a total of roughly 2 million words. We will consider i) prosodic integration (Dehé & Wichmann 2010), ii) contextual clues, iii) morphological/semantic characteristics of the verb, iv) given/new subject, iv) type/token frequency. We will discuss if the considered *verba putandi* show differences or analogies (in terms of syntactic position, prosody and function) with discourse markers with evidential or epistemic values. This will allow us to discuss whether and which of the considered constructions are undergoing a process of *reanalysis*. Furthermore, this provides a possible explanation for the subjunctive/indicative alternation in the analyzed constructions, showing that syntax is revealing of illocution/speaker’s intentions/evidentiality.

Apothéloz, D. 2003. La rection dite ‘faible’: grammaticalisation ou différentiel de grammaticalité?. *Verbum* 25(3): 241-262.

Dehé, N. & Wichmann, A. 2010. Sentence-initial *I think (that)* and *I believe (that)*. Prosodic evidence for use as main clause, comment clause and discourse marker. *Studies in Language* (34): 36-74.

Sbisà, M. 2014. Evidentiality and Illocution. *Intercultural pragmatics* 11(3): 463-483.

Serianni, L. 2010 [1989]. *Grammatica italiana. Italiano comune e lingua letteraria*. Torino, UTET.

Thompson, S. & Mulac, A. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In Traugott, E. & Heine, B. (Eds.), *Types of grammatical markers*. Amsterdam, Benjamins, 313-327.