

The diachrony of Galician *certamente* and
seguramente: A case of grammatical
constructionalization*

Vítor Míguez 

Instituto da Lingua Galega / University of Santiago de
Compostela

*©2021 John Benjamins Publishing Company. This is the author accepted manuscript. The published version can be cited as Míguez, V. (2021). The diachrony of Galician *certamente* and *seguramente*: A case of grammatical constructionalization. In M. Hilpert, B. Cappelle, & I. Depraetere (Eds.), *Modality and diachronic construction grammar* (pp. 123–148). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.32.05mig>

Abstract

This paper addresses the evolution of two Galician adverbs, *certamente* and *seguramente*. Data from three different periods show that they had similar manner, modal and discourse functions in the Middle Ages, as opposed to their distinct functional profiles in more recent days. The theoretical analysis is based on Traugott and Trousdale’s (2013) framework, and shows that several instances of grammatical constructionalization occurred since the emergence of *-mente* adverbs out of a Latin instrumental construction until the appearance of (inter)subjective markers. The current study also reveals that *certamente* has become a strengthener and, to a lesser extent, a certainty marker, whereas *seguramente* expresses probability. The semantic evolution of the adverbs, from manner, through strengthening, to epistemic modality, is in contradiction with the unidirectionality of (inter)subjectification, whereas the loss of intersubjective functions in *seguramente* is a case of deintersubjectification. Previous research shows that this is a recurrent pattern for epistemic and evidential expressions.

1 Introduction

In present-day Galician, *certamente* and *seguramente* are two adverbs with a divergent functional profile. *Certamente* expresses certainty and strengthening, similarly to English *certainly* (Byloo, Kastein, & Nuyts, 2007; Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer, 2007), whereas *seguramente* encodes an epistemic value of (high) probability (Míguez, 2019). (1) offers typical occurrences of these adverbs in present-day prose (hereafter all translations are mine, unless stated otherwise).

- (1) a. *O meu sangue **certamente** era azul, pero con eso non abondaba neste tempo.*
 ‘My blood was certainly blue, but that was not enough in these times.’ (1985, CERTNARR0099, CORGA)
- b. *Baixo a mesa do altar descubríase case agochada unha ara romana. **Seguramente** era unha pedra votiva, máis pagá imposible.*
 ‘Under the table of the altar one could see a Roman ara, almost hidden. It most probably was a votive stone, it could not be more pagan.’ (2011, SEGUNARR1088, CORGA)

(1) features sentential uses of the two adverbs, where they scope over a whole predication. In (1a) *certamente* reinforces the content of the first clause. In (1b) *seguramente* qualifies the explanation given by the writer in terms of likelihood. However, these formal and functional patterns differ, some times notably, from the semantic and syntactic features these adverbs had in earlier periods of the language.

There has been some interest in the diachrony of modal and discourse adverbs at least since Traugott (1989). Particular expressions such as English *maybe* (López-Couso & Méndez-Naya, 2016) and *perhaps* (Suzuki, 2018), Galician/Spanish *se cadra/si cuadra* (Rodríguez-Espiñeira, 2019), Spanish *tal vez* (Cornillie, 2016), or Romance *-mente* adverbs (e.g. Hummel, 2018; Suárez Hernández, 2018) have received historical-linguistic accounts in recent times. However, most Galician epistemic expressions remain unaccounted for in terms of diachrony. The syntactic and semantic development of Galician *certamente* and *seguramente* will be the focus of the present paper.

From a theoretical standpoint, the development of modal and discourse adverbs is usually explained in terms of (*inter*)*subjectification* (e.g. Traugott & Dasher, 2002) and *grammaticalization* (e.g. Hopper & Traugott, 2003). Work within this framework considers that adverbs gain syntactic freedom

and increase their structural scope while their meaning becomes more (inter)subjective. Downing (2008) and Traugott (2014) argue that this is the case of English *surely*, which, according to them, developed from a manner adverb, through an epistemic marker, to a discourse particle.

(Inter)subjectification is one of the most influential hypotheses in semantic change. It claims that meanings evolve from the description of the world, to the expression of speaker's attitudes and, finally, the speaker's stance toward the hearer, as reflected in (2).

(2) non-subjective > subjective > intersubjective

(Traugott & Dasher, 2002, p. 281)

An important assumption, present in Traugott's work (e.g. Traugott, 2003, 2007; Traugott & Dasher, 2002), is the unidirectionality of (inter)subjectification: meanings change in the direction of increased (inter)subjectivity, but not the other way around. In other words, (2) cannot be run through from right to left – there is no de(inter)subjectification. Nevertheless, some counterexamples to this hypothesis have been spotted in different domains of grammar (López-Couso, 2010, pp. 142–143), the most prominent collection of which is found in the realm of epistemic and evidential expressions, particularly in the work of Cornillie (2008, 2016). This author shows that the development of expressions such as the Spanish evidential (semi-)auxiliaries *resultar* and *parecer*, the epistemic adverbs *tal vez* and *quizás*, and even some of Traugott and Dasher's (2002) own applications of the notion to modality contradict the unidirectionality principle, insofar as they instantiate cases in which modal expressions develop intersubjective readings before subjective ones.

Grammaticalization is the development of a (more) grammatical status, typically out of a fully-lexical item. This morphosyntactic development entails a semantic shift from contentful to procedural meaning, i.e. “abstract meaning that signals linguistic relations, perspectives and deictic orientation” (Traugott & Trousdale, 2013, p. 12). Thus, grammaticalization intersects

with (inter)subjectification: (inter)subjective meanings are procedural, as they are concerned with the interlocutors' perspective, and usually originate from non-subjective, contentful ones.

Another key notion in understanding the development of new forms and meanings is that of ambiguous contexts. These are *critical* contexts “characterized by multiple structural and semantic ambiguities and thus invite[s] several alternative interpretations” (Diewald, 2002, p. 103), the new ones being invited inferences which may lead to the conventionalization of a new meaning (Traugott & Dasher, 2002). *Isolating* contexts, “i.e. specific linguistic contexts that favor one reading to the exclusion of the other” (Diewald, 2002, p. 103), are a further step which favors the separation of the old meaning from the new one.

Traugott and Trousdale (2013) adapt (some of) the previous ideas into a constructional framework where linguistic changes are understood as a set of alterations in a network of constructions. These alterations may either affect some dimension of an existing construction (constructional change) or lead to the emergence of a new combination of form and meaning, i.e. a new node in the constructional network (constructionalization).¹ Traugott and Trousdale (2013) further distinguish between the constructionalization of items with procedural and contentful meanings. The current study aims at showing that the diachronic trajectories of *certamente* and *seguramente* involve the development of procedural meaning, and are, therefore, instances of grammatical constructionalization.

Although a semantic evolution in terms of (inter)subjectification is logically possible, the most likely diachronic path is one where the emergence of the subjective epistemic meaning of certainty followed the development of an intersubjective strengthening meaning, which, in turn, evolved out of

¹Note that this characterization of constructionalization differs from Traugott and Trousdale's “creation of a form_{new}-meaning_{new} pairing” (2013, p. 22). It is not the newness of both the formal and the functional side that leads to a new sign, but the newness of the connection between the two sides – see Diewald et al. (this volume) for further discussion.

non-subjective manner uses. Structural and functional ambiguities between manner and strengthening uses, on the one hand, and between strengthening and epistemic uses, on the other, are central to this consideration. Thus, I will claim that the evolution of *certamente* and *seguramente* contradicts the unidirectionality from subjective to intersubjective meanings. Furthermore, the loss of the intersubjective uses of *seguramente* in favor of an epistemic meaning of probability represents a case of deintersubjectification or loss of intersubjective functions.²

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 explains the data and method used in the corpus study, the results of which are presented in Section 3 together with a description of the diachronic trajectory of *certamente* and *seguramente*. Section 4 accounts for the results in terms of constructionalizations and constructional changes. Section 5 sums up and discusses the main findings.

2 Data and analytical categories

Relying on linguistic data from previous ages usually means trusting written language, which is typically associated with communicative distance. Historical pragmatics prefers the language of immediacy, that is, language that can be considered as close as possible to spontaneous spoken discourse (Taavitsainen & Jucker, 2010, pp. 7–10). The scarcity of data of this kind should not pose a problem for the study of *-mente* adverbs, since these items are associated with literary written language, which, in turn, is characterized by communicative distance (Company Company, 2012). The main problem

²A reviewer points out that “subjectification from an intersubjective reading” might be a more adequate wording. This is unfortunate, though, since intersubjective meaning is already subjective, as “there cannot be intersubjectification without some degree of subjectification because it is SP/W [the speaker/writer] who designs the utterance and who recruits the meaning for social deictic purposes” (Traugott & Dasher, 2002, p. 31).

for the historical study of *-mente* in Galician is its low frequency in old texts, and the lack of data for the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries.

The socio-political status of a language (or, rather, its speakers) directly determines to what extent that language is used in writing and, consequently, for most of history, how much linguistic data from a particular language stage will reach the future. In the case of the Galician language, this means that we have good sources for the medieval period, when Galician enjoyed the status of literary language in western Iberia and was the main written and spoken language in Galicia. After the year 1500, however, almost three centuries followed in which the written form of the language was almost completely abandoned. This was a consequence of socio-political changes that took place at the end of the 15th century, namely the loss of power by Galician elites and the implementation of centralist policies by the Crown of Castile. Thus, very little first-hand evidence remains on Modern Galician in its early stages – for an overview of the history of Galician see Mariño Paz (2008) and Monteagudo (1999).

Due to (the) data (frequency) limitations, the current study is centered around three chronological periods: medieval (1200–1460), early contemporary (1880–1930), and present-day (1975–2014). Alongside these specific time frames, I will use the more general labels “Old Galician” and “Modern Galician” to refer to the language before and after the year 1500, respectively. Data were obtained from three electronic corpora: the *Tesouro Medieval Informatizado da Lingua Galega* (TMILG) for medieval data, the *Tesouro Informatizado da Lingua Galega* (TILG) for early contemporary data, and the *Corpus de Referencia do Galego Actual* (CORGA) for present-day data. Samples of up to 100 occurrences per adverb and period were taken. However, the scarcity of the medieval data made it impossible to reach, even approach, this figure – only 11 cases of *certamente* and 23 of *seguramente* were found in this period.

Since this study focuses on the development of (inter)subjective functions,

occurrences of the adverbs within an adjective phrase were excluded. This is relevant in the case of *certamente*, which in this context has evolved toward an intensifier (e.g. *certamente bo* ‘really good’). González Manzano (2010, 2013) discusses the development of this function in Spanish *ciertamente*, *realmente*, and *verdaderamente*. She shows that uses of this type first appeared during the 15th and 16th centuries, and relates its emergence to the grammaticalization of the intersubjective functions of the adverbs. It is therefore safe to assume that the intensifier function in the adjectival domain did not play a role in the development of the older manner and post-manner functions of the adverbs.

The analysis consists of a classification of every instance of an adverb into one or more functional categories. Following Byloo et al. (2007), categories have been established through observation of the data, i.e. finding differences and similarities between occurrences. Three main meanings or uses are identified in the evolution of the two Galician adverbs under investigation: a non-subjective meaning of manner, a subjective meaning of epistemic modality, and an intersubjective strengthening meaning. In addition, an intersubjective “pragmatic” meaning was detected in *seguramente* – I will use the label ‘post-manner’ to refer to the (inter)subjective uses of the adverbs. The remainder of this section offers an explanation and illustrations of the analytical categories used in the corpus study.

2.1 *Manner uses*

The notion of manner does not denote, *stricto sensu*, a particular meaning but rather a functional slot in the verbal periphery. The arguments for keeping the several meanings within manner under the same category respond to the facts that (i) there are not many instances of manner uses throughout the data (28 in total, see Section 3), and (ii) they do not differ greatly (they are usually related through metonymy).

Certamente as a manner adverb occurs alongside verbs of locution, such

as *rresponder* ‘answer, reply’ and *dizer* ‘say, tell’, and cognitive verbs like *creer* ‘believe’ and *saber* ‘know’, (3). Both with verbs of locution and verbs of cognition, the meaning of the adverb lies in the realm of truthfulness, coding that what is said or known converges with what is (considered to be) true.

- (3) a. *Ca doutra maneyra nã poderia **certamente** rresponder el demãdado nẽ o juiz dar sua sentença.*
 ‘Since otherwise the defendant could not answer truthfully nor could the judge issue his sentence.’
 (1326–1375, TPc II 26/38, TMILG)
- b. *Pois que tu est’oyd’ás, e creo **certãamente** que con eles jantarás, rogo-t’eu que vaa tigo comer de tan bon manjar.*
 ‘Since you have heard this, and I truly believe that you will share the midday meal with them, I ask to go with you and eat such delicacy.’
 (1264–1284, CSM II , TMILG)
- c. *Et esto toveron que era dereyto por duas rrazões. A primeyra porque quando soubessen **certamente** a rrazõ porque e sua ...*
 ‘And they found that this was right for two reasons. First, because when they knew for sure the reason why is his ...’
 (1325–1374, TPc II 25/38, TMILG)

Seguramente seems to be more polysemous in its manner uses. With motion verbs (like *andar* ‘walk’, *chegarse* ‘approach’, *sair* ‘exit’, *viir* ‘come’), and action verbs in general (like *comer* ‘eat’, *laurar* ‘work’) it means ‘safely’, ‘confidently’, or ‘steadfastly’, (4). With verbs of locution, *seguramente* also expressed meanings of safety and confidence, as in (5a), which in some contexts coexisted with meanings of truthfulness, like those typical of *certamente*, as in (5b).³

³Similar semantic patterns were detected for Spanish *seguramente* (Villar Díaz, 2016, pp. 376–378) and English *surely* (Traugott, 2014, p. 79).

- (4) a. *Et mandoos que laurassem et criassem **seguramente** et que lly dessem seu peyto, segũdo que o dauã a seu rrey.*
 ‘And he ordered them to work and breed steadfastly and to pay him a tax, as they did with their king.’
 (1295–1312, TC 346/512, TMILG)
- b. *... non ousades de andar **seguramente** por la terra donde sodes natural ...*
 ‘... you do not dare walk safely in the land where you were born ...’
 (1434, MNP 110/150, TMILG)
- c. *... que os mercadores e vesiños de Santiago e do arçobispado non ousauan viir a esta çibdade **seguramente** con suas mercadorías ...*
 ‘... that the merchants and neighbors of Santiago and the archbishopric did not dare come safely to this city with their merchandise ...’
 (1446, VFD 177/82, TMILG)
- (5) a. *Et sabede que en aquel tẽpo era costume que todo messageyro andasse en saluo per huquer, et que **segurament** cõtasse seu messagẽ, et nõca por ende mal rreçebessen.*
 ‘And be it known unto you that at that time it was customary for a messenger to walk anywhere safely, and that he told his message safely, and that no harm was done to him because of that.’
 (1370–1373, CT 20/236, TMILG)
- b. *... disse hũ sabio que ouo nome Tulio, que en nehũa cousa nõ pode homẽ auer amĩgo a quẽ podesse dizer **seguramente** sua uoentade, assi coũo a ssi meesmo;*
 ‘... a wise man named Tullius said that no one in any respect may have a friend to whom he can safely/truthfully tell his will, as he does to himself.’
 (1300–1350, CPa XXVII, 4/126, TMILG)

In early contemporary and present-day language, manner uses of *certamente* are restricted to combinations with *saber*, like (6a). In the early contemporary sample *seguramente* features one manner use with the verb *encamiñar* ‘direct, guide’. It is coordinated with another *-mente* adverb, and means ‘safely’ or ‘steadfastly’, see (6b). No manner use is attested for *seguramente* in the present-day sample.

- (6) a. *Cantas veces paso, cantas me paro a revisar tódalas pedras que me parecen de interese, por se algunha puidera pertencer a estes pazos, que non sabemos **certamente** ónde estaban.*

‘How many times do I pass by, how many times do I stop to check all the rocks that I find interesting, in case any of them could belong to these manor houses, which we do not know for sure where they were.’
(2002, CERTXORN0146, CORGA)

- b. *... de vós pende encamiñar dereita- e **seguramente** as cousas pra o pro comunal;*

‘... it is up to you to steer things directly and securely toward the common good.’
(1895, SEGUTILG0028, TILG)

2.2 Epistemic uses

Epistemic modality is an estimation of the degree of likelihood that an event takes/has taken/will take place, as made by the speaker (Nuyts, 2001). The epistemic use of *certamente* corresponds to the expression of certainty (i.e. 100% likelihood) in all periods, as seen in (7).

- (7) a. *Et o prior foy muy aqueixado conos mouros et viose en muy gran coyta, ca **certamēte** ouuerano morto ou leuado, senõ fora por esses que cõ el seyrã ...*

‘And the prior was really bothered by the Moors and found himself in such a big trouble, that he would certainly have been killed or captured, if it were not for those who had gone out with him ...’

(1295–1312, TC 600/864, TMILG)

- b. *A influencia que dito ensino técnico moderno terá na Galicia será enorme. **Certamente** trairá consigo unha época d’actividade industrial, é dicir, da que sexa de todo adaptada ao noso país.*

‘The influence that the said modern technical training will have in Galicia will be huge. It will certainly bring an era of industrial activity, that is to say, one that is totally adapted to our country.’

(1930, CERTTILG0170, TILG)

- c. *Pois tampouco pagaba a pena vivir se tiña de facelo en permanente anguria. Diante de todo contaba a súa tranquilidade. E **certamente** un crime non sería o que mellor lla aportaría.*

‘Living was not worth it if it had to be done in permanent anguish. His peace of mind was first. And a crime would certainly not be the best thing to give him it.’ (1991, CERTNARR0173, CORGA)

In the medieval period, the epistemic use of *seguramente* also entailed certainty, as in (8).

- (8) *e quando foi na cidade, peor enferma moller non vistes do que foi ela; ca pero de Monpisler bõos fisicos y eran, dizian: “Non viverá.” E por que esto que dizian non era mui sen razon, ca d’aver ela seu fillo estava ena sazon; e avia tan gran fever, que quena viya enton dizia: “**Seguramente**, desta non escapará”.*

‘and when she was in the city, she was sicker than anyone you have ever seen; even though there were good physicians from Montpellier, they said: “She will not live.” And they said so not without reason, because she was about to have her child; and she had such a big fever, that those who saw her at that moment said: “Surely, she will not get out of this”?’

(1264–1284, CSM 256/26, TMILG)

In present-day language the epistemic value of *seguramente* is that of (high) probability, as already seen in (1b). Early contemporary examples represent a middle ground, since the adverb could express both certainty and (high) probability, see (9).⁴

- (9) a. *Dios lle conserve a vida ó señor Pondal e lle dea saúde pra que, canto antes, poidamos saborear súas novas produciós, que **seguramente** serán unha notabre adquisición prá literatura rexional.*

‘May God preserve the life of mister Pondal and give him health so that, as soon as possible, we can relish his new works, which will surely/?most probably be a remarkable acquisition for the regional literature.’

(1886, SEGUTILG0001, TILG)

⁴A detailed analysis of the epistemic uses of *seguramente* can be found in Míguez (2019).

- b. *Dáme o corpo que quen fixo tal escamoteo é, **seguramente**, partidario de qu'as imaxes se arromben nin máis nin menos, que asegún foron.*

‘I have a feeling that the person who did this legerdemain is surely/most probably in favor of arranging the statues nothing less than as they were.’ (1886, SEGUTILG0011, TILG)

2.3 *The strengthening use*

Byloo et al. (2007) and Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer (2007) distinguish between epistemic and strengthening uses – Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer use *emphasis* to refer to the latter. Historical studies tend not to differentiate them and consider them part of a single epistemic function – or, at best, regard the strengthening use as a nuance of the epistemic use. However, the uses are neatly different and their diachronic relation raises interesting implications for common assumptions regarding semantic change.

In the strengthening use, the adverbs reinforce the assertion they occur in. This assertion may be some kind of assessment or a statement, understood as a ‘neutral’ description of facts. The need to reinforce an assertion has to do with the speaker’s rhetorical purposes, such as showing agreement with the interlocutor or a third party. In (10a) and (10c) *certamente* strengthens a statement. In (10b) the same adverb reinforces the first clause, which contains a quality judgment and is followed by a *but*-clause.

- (10) a. *E el se foi **certamente**, por que de pran non podía na terra guarir un día;*

‘And he certainly left, because he really could not be at peace in his homeland one more day.’ (1240–1300, LP II 001/664, TMILG)

- b. ***Certamente** os románticos son exaltados, mais os crásicos poden sé-lo tamén.*
 ‘Certainly, the Romantics are impassioned, but the Classics can also be.’ (1922, CERTTILG0119, TILG)
- c. *Unha loba! A tarefa non era doada, máis ben era imposible. **Certamente**, as lobas, para parir e sacar adiante os seus lobetos, afástanse dos seus conxéneres, co que o fillo do ferreiro non tería que enfrontarse a toda unha manda.*
 ‘A she-wolf! The task was not easy, it was rather impossible. Indeed, she-wolves get away from their fellow wolves to carry forward their pups, so the blacksmith’s son wouldn’t have to deal with a whole pack of wolves.’ (2008, CERTNARR0704, CORGA)

Seguramente could also strengthen assertions. This is the case of the medieval example and the early contemporary one in (11). In the present-day sample, the strengthening use was not found.

- (11) a. *Et cõ todo esto era tã ben feyto ãno corpo et ãno rrostro que nõ achariades nehũ tãto, et **segurament**, cõmo diz Dayres, ben parecía caualleyro estando en praça.*
 ‘And with all this he had such a well-made body and face that you would not find another like him, and, surely, as Dares says, he really looked like a knight standing in the battlefield.’
 (1372–1373, CT 75/274, TMILG)
- b. *Si algún o negase, sobra sólo algunhas follas da hestórea contemporánea e cheas de lama e sangue atoparáias, **seguramente**;*
 ‘If someone denied it, there would be only a few superfluous pages of contemporary history, and (s)he would find them full of mud and blood, surely.’ (1917, SEGUTILG0049, TILG)

2.4 The pragmatic use

Pragmatic uses refer to cases where the adverb, instead of modifying the semantics of (some part of) the utterance, changes the nature of the speech act. Byloo et al. (2007) identified these uses in the case of Dutch *zeker*, particularly when the adverb is used to turn a declarative sentence into a special kind of interrogative – what they call a “declarogative.” This mechanism, comparable to a tag question, is used by speakers to ask for confirmation of their claims. English *surely* is used in the same way in what Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer (2007, p. 136) term “the opening-up function, reaching out to the addressee for confirmation.” (12) offers some of their examples.

- (12) a. *Hij zal wel weten wat ie kan **zeker**?*
‘He’ll know what he can do, won’t he?’
(Byloo et al., 2007, p. 52, their translation)
- b. Of course the chaos when the Supreme Being was discovered tied up and concussed on the floor would be indescribable, but *surely* they would need to be more than just lucky to win much more time out of mere chaos? (Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer, 2007, p. 136)

These interrogatives retain declarative syntax, as Byloo et al. (2007) point out, which is a clear indication that they cannot be considered true questions. The adverb does not function in this context as an epistemic or strengthening device, but as a signal of this particular kind of speech act. The only instance of this use in the data of the current study corresponds to *seguramente* in the early contemporary period.

- (13) *Mar.:—¿Xa pensas botarlle o lazo? Mer.:—Como poida atrapá-lo... Non é fácil atopar un bon partido non saíndo d'aquí, de sorte que se algún aparece por casualidá, hai que tratar de cazá-lo... Inda que teña que correr atrás del, como cando andamos perseguindo as bolboretas. Mar.:—¿E **seguramente** irá hoxe ao baile do Casino? Mer.:—Por eso vou eu. Mar.:—Daquela é mellor para o éisito dos teus proieitos que m'eu quede na casa (rindo).*
- 'Mar.:—Are you already thinking of snaring him? Mer.:—If I could catch him... It isn't easy to find a good catch without getting out of here, so if someone appears by chance, one must try to catch him... Even if you have to run after him, like when we chase butterflies. Mar.:—And surely he will go today to the ball at the Casino? Mer.:—That's why I'm going. Mar.:—Then it will be best for the success of your plan that I stay at home [laughing].' (1920, CERTTILG0076, TILG)

In (13) Mar. seeks confirmation of a fact that she assumes to be the case, and introduces *seguramente* in her apparently interrogative sentence. It is significant that Mer.'s reply does not answer the question but elaborates on the topic, thus treating Mar.'s question as a declarative clause.

2.5 A note on syntax

From a formal point of view, manner uses occur near the verb, usually immediately before or after it, although intervening material is inserted between them in some cases – witness (4c), where the second argument of *viir*, *a esta cidade*, appears between the verb and the adverb. Manner adverbs are complements of the verb and occur within the verb phrase: they have *phrasal syntax*.

In contrast, epistemic, strengthening, and pragmatic uses occur either in initial, medial, or final position in the utterance. They are prosodically independent, as evidenced by the use of commas in examples such as (9b),

(10c), and (11b). The amount and type of intervening material that can occur between the adverbs in their post-manner uses and the main verb of the clause is less restricted than in the case of manner uses: for instance, *certamente* and the verb form *afástanse* in (10c) are separated not just by the verb phrase-external argument of the verb – the subject *as lobas* – but also by the final adjunct headed by *para*. Post-manner adverbs do not complement the verb but scope over the whole sentence, whence their greater positional freedom: they have *sentential syntax*.

2.6 Ambiguities

Sometimes it was not possible to assign a single value to a particular occurrence of an adverb. In such cases, all the values observed were counted – in practice, there was no instance in which more than two values were registered. Six different two-value combinations are logically possible, but only two were found. First, the uses may be ambiguous between a manner and a strengthening meaning. This is the case of two occurrences of *certamente* together with the verb *saber* in early contemporary texts. An example can be found in (14).

- (14) *Ademais, como non se sabe **certamente** nada de nada en custión de esta clas, nin il ha recibir dato certo, nin podrá, polo mesmo, diutar medida xusta.*

‘Besides, since nothing is known for sure/nothing is certainly known about this matter, neither will he get truthful information, nor will he be able, for the same reason, to issue just measures.’

(1919, CERTTILG0098, TILG)

In present-day Galician manner adverbs must appear right after the verb – the preverbal position is regarded as archaic. *Certamente* in (14) is ambiguous between a manner and a strengthening use in part because it occurs in this position. In Old Galician manner adverbs enjoyed more syntactic freedom,

since they also appeared preceding the verb, as seen in examples (3a) and (5a) above. In (15) *certamente* and *seguramente* precede the verb and are ambiguous between a manner reading (modifying the speech verbs *dizer* and *demandar* ‘ask’) and a strengthening reading.

- (15) a. *Mai-lo Papa Cremente **certamente** lle disse: “Essa ora, sen demora, te vai pera Suria ... ”*
 ‘And Pope Clement truthfully/indeed told him: “Right now, without delay, you go to Syria ...”’
 (1264–1284, CSM 115/427, TMILG)
- b. *Ben pode **seguramente** demanda-lo que quiser aa Virgen tod’aquele que en ela ben crever.*
 ‘Anyone who really believes in the Virgin can surely/safely ask her what they want.’ (1264–1284, CSM II 271/61, TMILG)

The second kind of ambiguity is between a strengthening and an epistemic use. This ambiguity is very common in early contemporary and present-day *certamente* but is also observed in medieval and early contemporary *seguramente*.

- (16) a. *As leis qu’agariman ós obreiros non rezan prós nosos campesiños, i é **certamente** por non teren apricaceón.*
 ‘The laws that safeguard workers do not pray for our peasants, and that is certainly because they are not enforced.’
 (1917, CERTTILG0079, TILG)
- b. *Vedes, fremeosa mia senhor, **segurament(e)** o que farei: Entanto com’eu vivo for, nunca vos mia coita direi; ca non m’avedes a creer, macar me vejades morrer.*
 ‘See, my beautiful lady, what I will surely do: as long as I am alive, I will never tell you my grief; since you would not believe me, even if you saw me die.’ (1220–1240, LP I 031/327, TMILG)

- c. —*Eu coïdo coma ti qu'isto non pode seguir moito tempo. —E non seguirá **seguramente**, se deixando de unha vès pra sempre d'alaiar e xemer nos resolvemos a berrar todos a unha*
 ‘—I think, just like you, that this cannot go on like this much longer.
 —And it surely won’t if we stop complaining once and for all and decide to shout all together.’ (1917, SEGUTILG00050, TILG)

In examples like (16) *certamente* and *seguramente* can be read either as reinforcing the opinion of the speaker or as estimating as 100% likely that what he thinks is or would be the case.

At this point, we must also mention absolute uses, i.e. the adverb stands alone in an utterance, as a reaction to the previous context (Nuyts, 2001, pp. 89–91). These uses are relevant as an index of entrenchment of intersubjective functions, but, since they are typically oral and we are dealing with written data, not many of them are to be expected. We do find some in early contemporary and present-day data, corresponding to strengthening uses. Significantly, the excerpts are dialogues found in the narrative genre, (17).⁵

- (17) a. *O que é ata agora, máis ben somos nós os que bailamos ó son da súa música. ¿Non che parece? —**Certamente**.*
 ‘As for now, it is us who dance to their music, don’t you think?
 —Certainly.’ (1917, SEGUTILG0049, TILG)

⁵Absolute uses are also taken to signal an advanced stage of development in cases where formal fusion is at stake, such as that of *like*-parentheticals, e.g. the use of *looks like* as an epistemic/evidential expression (López-Couso & Méndez-Naya, 2014). Since the formal unity of the suffix *-mente* and its adjectival base was already well established in the medieval period (Hummel, 2013a, pp. 20–21), absolute uses are not very relevant in this connection.

- b. —*Agardalle, sen dúbida, un glorioso porvir. —¿Como o de vostede? —Ou poida que mellor. Serán vostedes felices. —¿Éo vostede? A afouteza da inquisición estranou a Ramiro. —**Seguramente**—afirmou.*

‘A great future is, no doubt, awaiting you. —Like yours? —Or maybe better. You will be happy. —Are you?—the audacity of the inquiry surprised Ramiro. —Surely—he affirmed.’

(1927, SEGUTILG0121, TILG)

In their absolute uses, *certamente* and *seguramente* strengthen the assessment present in the previous utterance – the opinion of the interlocutor in (17a), the statement of well-being implicit in the question in (17b) – but in some cases they can also be taken to express an epistemic qualification – thus, (17a) is ambiguous between the strengthening reading and an epistemic reading (i.e. ‘it is 100% likely that what you said is true’).

3 Corpus findings

This section presents the results of the corpus study together with a discussion of the data. The presence of ambiguous instances requires the use of a minimal and a maximal count (see Byloo et al., 2007). The minimal count includes only unambiguous instances, whereas the maximal count includes all occurrences. As a consequence of this, when there are ambiguous instances in a sample, neither the minimal nor the maximal count add up to the total number of examples in the sample. The tables below display the data for each adverb separately, except for the medieval period, where a sum of both is also provided. This is due to the scarcity of medieval data and the similarity of both adverbs in that period. All tables include the number of ambiguous cases. For early contemporary and present-day language, whose samples amount to 100 cases, absolute and percentual values are equivalent. In the

case of medieval data, they are provided in different tables.

Table 1 shows the absolute values for the minimal and maximal counts of *certamente*, *seguramente* and their sum in the medieval period. Table 2 presents the relative values for the same data.

Table 1: Absolute frequencies of the different uses of *certamente* and *seguramente* in medieval language

	<i>certamente</i>	<i>seguramente</i>	sum
	n = 11	n = 23	n = 34
	min (max)	min (max)	min (max)
manner	7 (8)	11 (13)	18 (21)
epistemic	2 (2)	2 (6)	4 (8)
strengthening	1 (2)	4 (10)	5 (12)
pragmatic	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
ambiguity	1	6	7

Table 2: Share of the different uses of *certamente* and *seguramente* in medieval language

	<i>certamente</i>	<i>seguramente</i>	sum
	n = 11	n = 23	n = 34
	min (max)	min (max)	min (max)
manner	63.64 (72.73)	47.83 (56.52)	52.94 (61.76)
epistemic	18.18 (18.18)	08.70 (26.09)	11.76 (23.53)
strengthening	09.09 (18.18)	17.39 (43.48)	14.71 (35.29)
pragmatic	00.00 (00.00)	00.00 (00.00)	00.00 (00.00)
ambiguity	09.09	26.00	20.59

In the medieval data only 11 occurrences of *certamente*, and 23 of *seguramente* were found. Such a low number of occurrences may be considered not enough to draw sound conclusions about the characteristics of the adverbs in Old Galician. Nevertheless, a cautious analysis of the sum of the results for both adverbs reveals some interesting patterns.

Manner is, by far, the most frequent use in both counts. Strengthening comes second and epistemic modality is last. There are few cases of ambiguous

manner, as opposed to half of epistemic and more than half of strengthening uses. The prevalence of manner (in terms of frequency and non-ambiguity) is in accordance with the idea that this is the oldest use of the adverbs. The high ambiguity levels of the other uses may be taken to signal their lack of (complete) conventionalization and, thus, their novelty. In the case of strengthening, these levels are certainly also related to its participation in both types of ambiguities (manner/strengthening, strengthening/epistemic).

Other relevant information comes out when we take a closer approach to the particular text types *certamente* and *seguramente* appeared in. There were three main written genres in Old Galician: administrative prose, non-administrative prose (which included literary, historical, religious, technical, and juridical texts), and poetry. Administrative prose accounts for almost 80% of the preserved corpus. Nevertheless, almost half of *-mente* adverbs in TMILG are found in non-administrative prose, particularly in literary prose.⁶ These numbers match the common view that *-mente* adverbs found their niche in high literary registers.⁷

In administrative texts, only *seguramente* is documented and works as a manner adjunct meaning ‘safely, with confidence’, usually with motion verbs, as illustrated by the examples (4b) and (4c) above. This is expectable, since administrative prose is a genre, usually related to declarative speech acts, with no room for (inter)subjective meanings. That is why only manner (i.e. non-subjective) uses are found in such texts.

This is not the case, though, of non-administrative prose, where facts are not only reported, but also assessed by the writer. Thus, in these texts we find both manner uses, such as (3a) and (4a), and post-manner uses, such

⁶For this estimation, I have analyzed the distribution by text type of all *-mente* adverbs starting with either *a*, *b*, *c*, or *d* in TMILG.

⁷A special feature in the evolution of *-mente* adverbs is that they are an innovation of higher registers, contrary to the widely held assumption that linguistic innovations pop up in colloquial language and only then do they reach formal texts. In fact, the relation of *-mente* with formal speech dates back to the early days of the construction in Latin high-level poetry (Bauer, 2010, p. 340).

as (7a), where *certamente* conveys an epistemic evaluation, and (11a), where *seguramente* reinforces the writer's aesthetic judgment, showing agreement with an external source.

Finally, in medieval poetry we observe a difference between *certamente* and *seguramente*. The former conveys manner more often than post-manner meanings, whereas the latter performs almost exclusively (inter)subjective functions. This is at odds with what was reported for Spanish by Villar Díaz (2013): in Galician, both adverbs are used as strengtheners or epistemic markers from the earliest attestations – that is, the first half of the 13th century, see the poetry examples (10a) and (16b) – but these functions were much more frequent in *seguramente*; in Spanish, post-manner uses of *seguramente* are not documented until the second half of the 15th century (Villar Díaz, 2013, p. 192), that is to say, more than 200 years later than in Galician.

In this connection Company Company (2012) argues that books of conduct played a major role in the development of *-mente* in Spanish. There was no books of conduct as such in Old Galician. There was, instead, a literary movement that had no equivalent in Spanish, usually known as Galician-Portuguese lyrical poetry and dated from 1200 to 1350 – most of the poetry data from the medieval period corresponds to this literary movement. Although the share of *-mente* adverbs found in poetry is substantially smaller than that of literary prose – but still higher than that of administrative texts – *-mente* adverbs in poetry are very prominent from a qualitative point of view, since this genre sets the stage for intersubjective uses: texts were written in the first person and referred directly to an interlocutor. The lack of texts of this type in Spanish may account for the differences observed in the early development of the adverbs.

After the second half of the 15th century, we lose track of *certamente* and *seguramente*. The next occurrence of *certamente* is in a play in verse from 1697 found in TILG, where it functions as a manner adjunct to the verb *crer*

‘believe’. This is an exception because *-mente* adverbs in general, and their (inter)subjective functions in particular, do not become frequent in Modern Galician until the second half of the 19th century. This has to do with the link between these linguistic devices and high-level written genres: *-mente* adverbs (re)emerge in Modern Galician when new types of prose (fictional, journalistic, essayistic, technical) develop at the end of the 19th century.⁸

A look at the results from the early contemporary period in Table 3 shows that modern *certamente* and *seguramente* are very different from their medieval counterparts – and from one another. *Certamente* has now strengthening as its main meaning, while epistemic modality is marginal and very prone to ambiguity. The most frequent use of *seguramente* is epistemic, whereas strengthening occupies a marginal place in its semantics and is quite invulnerable to ambiguity. This adverb also presents one unambiguous pragmatic use. Manner, in both cases, is extremely rare. These results reveal a shift from primarily manner adverbs to discourse and modal markers, which, of course, is not sharp and takes place over the course of four centuries.

Table 3: Share of the different meanings of *certamente* and *seguramente* in early contemporary language

	<i>certamente</i> n = 100 min (max)	<i>seguramente</i> n = 100 min (max)
manner	1 (3)	1 (1)
epistemic	6 (19)	87 (90)
strengthening	78 (93)	8 (11)
pragmatic	0 (0)	1 (1)
ambiguity	16	3

Finally, the results for present-day language in Table 4 show minor differences to the previous period, as is expected given the small temporal distance.

⁸During this period, we attest the popular variant *-mentes*, with a final *-s*. Nevertheless, in line with the disappearance of the vernacular variants of *-mente* in Old Spanish, that is, *-miente* and variants (Company Company, 2012), this modern popular variant in Galician was never very frequent and declined quickly.

Changes in *certamente* are negligible, whereas *seguramente* establishes its role as an epistemic adverb, and loses all other uses. The absence of the manner use is the result of a long-standing shift from a manner to a post-manner adverb. As in early contemporary language, the manner use of *seguramente* is nearly extinct in present-day language, but still retrievable in very marked contexts, where confusion with the epistemic meaning is unlikely. The manner uses of *certamente* are somewhat different, since all of them respond to collocations with the verb *saber*. This pattern was also detected for Dutch *zeker* (Byloo et al., 2007, p. 38), and is, very likely, the fossilization of a medieval collocation.

Table 4: Share of the different meanings of *certamente* and *seguramente* in present-day language

	<i>certamente</i>	<i>seguramente</i>
	n = 100	n = 100
	min (max)	min (max)
manner	3 (3)	0 (0)
epistemic	4 (20)	100 (100)
strengthening	77 (93)	0 (0)
pragmatic	0 (0)	0 (0)
ambiguity	17	0

4 A constructionalization approach

Most previous research on the diachrony of *-mente* advocates for the grammaticalization path manner adverb > sentence adverb > discourse marker. Yet some researchers support a “continuity perspective” that would allegedly exclude a grammaticalization scenario: Hummel (2013b, pp. 29–30) argues that the modal and discourse uses of Spanish *realmente* are a continuation of those of Late Latin *realiter*; similarly, according to Espinosa Elorza (2010, pp. 150–151), Latin *certo*, *enim* and *vero* were “adapted” in Spanish as *cierta-*

mente, *efectivamente* and *verdaderamente*, respectively. Nevertheless, it seems hard to find a Latin forerunner of every *-mente* adverb with a post-manner use, witness *seguramente*.⁹

If (some of) the meanings found in the Romance adverbs were borrowed from previous Latin constructions, the continuity perspective goes, grammaticalization (or constructionalization) would be short-circuited. This position faces at least two problems when applied to our data. First, if *certamente* and, more unlikely, *seguramente* borrowed the uses of Latin forerunners, their status in the Middle Ages would be a reflection of the functional profile, critical contexts included, of the borrowing forms. Thus, from a strict continuity perspective, there is no reason to conclude that the diachronic processes initiated in the original form do not live on in its continuator – in fact, doing so would reinforce the artificial limits between (Late) Latin and (Old) Romance this position is supposed to overcome. Second, the uses of Latin forerunners need to be analyzed in detail in order to establish a continuity between their functions and those of their Romance successors. The strengthening use is particularly concerning in this respect, since it is usually not isolated in historical studies, despite being key in understanding the development of the adverbs.

The present study has found evidence, in the form of critical contexts, of a constructionalization channel that leads from manner, through strengthening, to epistemic modality. Rather than just taking on the functions of earlier forms, it seems that *certamente* and *seguramente* continued a constructionalization process possibly begun by other adverbs. Since the Latin evidence that would support such claim is unavailable, I will focus on reconstructing the diachronic trajectory of the Galician adverbs.

⁹*Secure* and *securiter* were adverbial formations from Latin *securus* meaning ‘carelessly, heedlessly, fearlessly’ or, as their Romance successors, ‘safely, securely’ (Lewis & Short, 1879, p. 1656). Unlike *certo*, *enim* and *vero*, *secure* and *securiter* lacked post-manner meanings.

4.1 The emergence of (inter)subjective adverbs

Adverbs ending in *-mente* constitute a large and diverse set of linguistic items and exist in most present-day Romance languages. They originated from a Latin construction with the feminine noun *mente* (the instrumental-ablative form of *mens, mentis* ‘mind, mood’) preceded by an adjective. The Latin construction had both lexical (instrumental) and adverbial (manner) values (e.g. *timida mente* ‘with a timid mind/timidly’, Bauer, 2010, p. 342). In Romance languages *mente* led to a fully-fledged derivative suffix which creates adverbs out of adjectives in their feminine form. This morphological device had already become grammaticalized in the medieval period, at least since the 9th century (Hummel, 2013a, pp. 20–21).

Given that the Latin string ‘adj + *mente*’ raised implicatures of adverbial manner values, it is fair to assume that the suffix *-mente* was first used to create manner adverbs. Also, the manner uses were dominant in *certamente* and *seguramente* during the medieval period, and only later do the post-manner functions take over. There is a long-term shift from the semantics of manner – first in the form of a pragmatic inference in a (Latin) instrumental construction, then as the coded meaning of a (Romance) adverbial suffix – to more procedural meanings, and this is in line with a grammatical constructionalization scenario.

At the time when *certamente* and *seguramente* were used in Old Galician texts *-mente* was a productive suffix. Therefore, the manner uses of the adverbs were derivations from the adjectives *certo* ‘true, certain’ and *seguro* ‘safe, secure’ in their feminine form. The manner adverbs *certamente* and *seguramente* were instantiations (micro-constructions) of a more abstract, semantically more general pattern (a schema or schematic construction) in the *-mente* format, with phrasal syntax and the general meaning ‘manner’.

As for the post-manner uses, they emerged as invited inferences in the relevant critical contexts (manner/strengthening, strengthening/epistemic).

Although the strengthening use was the most ambiguous in the medieval period (7 out of 12, or more than 58% of occurrences), unambiguous cases, or *isolating* contexts, already existed (amounting to 5 out of 12, or more than 41% of cases), which point toward an increasing separation of the strengthening meaning from manner uses. In fact, the early development of such contexts enabled the rise of the epistemic meaning out of strengthening uses. In turn, these unambiguous sentential-scope readings fueled the development of sentential syntax. The eventual conventionalization of strengthening and epistemic meanings in a new syntactic packaging led to the constructionalization of two polysemic (strengthening and epistemic) post-manner adverbs, i.e. the creation of two new nodes in the constructional network, one for post-manner *certamente* and another one for post-manner *seguramente*. This process involved not just the development of (inter)subjective, therefore procedural, meaning, but also a decrease in compositionality, since the new (micro-)constructions were not linked to the manner schematic construction – they could not be productively derived from *-mente*.¹⁰

The said long-term shift from manner adverbs to polysemic post-manner markers is common to both *certamente* and *seguramente*, but the further arrangement of strengthening and epistemic meanings differs for each adverb. As regards *certamente*, the strengthening use became prominent without leading to the extinction of the epistemic use. This situation of unequal polysemy has been stable from the end of the 19th century to the beginning

¹⁰Present-day *-mente* forms not only manner adverbs, but also temporal adverbs (e.g. *antigamente* ‘in the past’), evidential markers (e.g. *obviamente* ‘obviously’), and “point-of-view” adverbials (e.g. *politicamente* ‘in political terms’), among others. This means that *-mente* became more schematic so as to produce different types of adverbial forms, not just manner ones. The particulars of this process are beyond the scope of this paper, but, from a usage-based constructional perspective, this must have happened in a bottom-up fashion – i.e. a change from token nodes (each ‘new’ *-mente* adverb with a temporal, evidential or epistemic meaning) to type node (a temporal, evidential or epistemic schema) as a result of generalization across similar micro-constructions. The growing number of non-manner *-mente* (sub)schemas eventually led to further schematization, whence the present-day *-mente* pattern with a rather vague procedural meaning.

of the 21st century, according to the data. The reasons for the predominance of the strengthening use may be pragmatic. Since the default expression for certainty (i.e. the epistemic value of *certamente*) is a bare assertion, the use of marked expressions of certainty must happen in extraordinary circumstances and have special pragmatic effects. Therefore, explicit references to certainty are infrequent in language, as the results above and Byloo et al.'s (2007) show. Conversely, strengthening is, from the point of view of communication, a very prominent function, usually related to the speaker's goals in discourse. This pragmatic suitability might have played an important role in the entrenchment of the strengthening use. The semantics of *seguramente*, though, followed a different path, that is to be addressed below.

4.2 *Seguramente: a new probability marker*

Qualifying a state of affairs with the highest epistemic value, instead of using an unqualified assertion, has apparently undesired pragmatic effects, such as signaling that the speaker is not really sure about what they are saying and/or that there is some reason to doubt it – otherwise, why would they “insist” on certainty? Considering this, one would expect that the epistemic value of a marker of certainty would either become weaker (go down the epistemic scale), as a result of the conventionalization of the implicature of uncertainty, or that it would be sparsely used. The latter is the case of *certamente*, whereas the evolution of *seguramente* conforms to the former.

Hummel (2018) and Míguez (2019) describe in some detail how certainty items become weaker over time. This has to do with the mentioned communicative profile of certainty markers, but also with the notion of subjectivity. Delbecque (2009) shows that the Spanish adjectives *cierto* and *seguro* are distinguished in terms of (inter)subjectivity (in the sense of Nuyts, 2001): *cierto* codes intersubjective certainty (shared between the speaker and others) and *seguro* subjective certainty (only ascribable to the speaker). The epis-

temic adverbs derived from the adjectives inherit this semantic trait (cf. the discourse patterns of Italian *certamente* and *sicuramente*, Pietrandrea, 2008), and that explains their different developments. The subjective certainty of *seguramente* favored the implicatures of uncertainty, which in the early contemporary period were already very general. This caused the collapse of the strengthening use, which is incompatible with the semantics of uncertainty, since this is associated with mitigation, rather than reinforcement (Míguez, 2019). The pragmatic use, in turn, relates to epistemic expressions with some degree of epistemic instability (the coding of both certainty and uncertainty), such as *surely* and *zeker* (Byloo et al., 2007, p. 55). *Seguramente* developed the uncertainty use somewhere in the early modern period,¹¹ and this probably opened the door for the pragmatic use. In the early contemporary language this use was nearly extinct, which is an indication of the near consolidation of the probability meaning. This meaning is conventionalized in present-day Galician, and is, in fact, the only meaning found in the sample. With this semantic shift *seguramente* experiences a decrease in compositionality, inasmuch as the link with the adjective *seguro*, which retains the certainty semantics, is broken. Thus, *seguramente* no longer opposes *certamente*, but *probablemente* ‘probably’, again in terms of (inter)subjectivity.

The semantic innovation of *seguramente* comes along with a change in morphosyntactic patterns. In several Romance languages, when an epistemic adverb precedes a finite verb, grammatical mood may alternate between the indicative and the subjunctive (see e.g. Yelin & Czerwionka, 2017). This alternation is possible with probability and possibility adverbs, but not with certainty markers. Crucially, present-day *seguramente* triggers the indicative/subjunctive alternation, like *probablemente* and unlike *certamente*. Series (18) illustrates this.

¹¹Studies on Spanish *seguramente* differ as to the precise dating: some situate it in the 18th century (Espinosa Elorza, 2014, p. 1077), whereas others situate it already in the 16th century (Villar Díaz, 2013, p. 192).

- (18) a. *Eles **seguramente** viana e estaban máis ó tanto da súa vida ca min ...*
 ‘They probably saw (IND) her and were (IND) more in the know about her life than me.’ (1991, SEGUNARR0097, CORGA)
- b. *Ben, se cadra é un mal exemplo, **seguramente** adoptasen o estilo por escandalizar, polo tabú que supón o consumo de mañoa.*
 ‘Well, maybe it is a bad example, they probably adopted (SUBJ) the style to scandalize, because of the taboo associated with the use of marijuana.’ (2007, SEGUNARR0672, CORGA)

The semantic shift from certainty to probability, together with the development of the mood alternation is an instance of grammatical constructionalization – notice the decrease in compositionality – and deintersubjectification – witness the loss of intersubjective functions, namely pragmatic and strengthening meanings.

5 Final remarks

The development of a suffix out of the Latin noun *mens* is a classic example of grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott, 2003, pp. 140–142). This paper has shown that such an advance toward a more grammatical status continues across some particular instances of Galician *-mente* adverbs, namely in the form of a shift from manner to post-manner meanings. It has also shown that the intersubjective strengthening meaning developed before (and led to) the subjective epistemic meaning, in contradiction with the unidirectionality of (inter)subjectification. Finally, the evolution of *seguramente* from an epistemic adverb with strengthening and pragmatic uses to a pure probability marker is an example of deintersubjectification. As is also the case with Spanish

epistemic adverb *tal vez* (Cornillie, 2016), the loss of the intersubjective uses in *seguramente* is accompanied by the development of the indicative/subjunctive alternation. The evolution of *certamente*, although not a case of deintersubjectification, verifies the importance of intersubjective uses in the early development of epistemic (and evidential) expressions. Interestingly, this seems to also be the case of English *surely*, since “[i]n older texts it has mainly an emphasizing [i.e. strengthening] function” (Traugott, 2014, p. 82).

Unidirectional (inter)subjectification is a robust tendency in language change, and some of the documented exceptions may be just apparent (López-Couso, 2010, pp. 142–143; Traugott, 2007, pp. 303–304). However, there is growing evidence that unidirectional (inter)subjectification may not be applied so easily to (or may be systematically circumvented by) a well-defined set of expressions, namely epistemic adverbs and evidential (semi-)auxiliaries. The reasons for this are not clear and deserve further investigation.

Other intriguing issues that arise from the current study have to do with the (inter)subjective (in Nuyts’ sense) features of *certamente* and *seguramente* – according to Nuyts (2001), adverbs are neutral as regards (inter)subjectivity – and the relation of the indicative/subjunctive alternation with the less intersubjective (in Traugott’s sense) uncertainty adverbs.

6 Acknowledgments

This work has received financial support from the European Union (European Social Fund – ESF) and the Xunta de Galicia (grant ED481A-2017/23). Thanks are due to Bert Cornillie, Francisco Cidrás, Gabriele Diewald, Ilse Depraetere and two anonymous reviewers for helping to improve the paper.

References

- Bauer, B. L. M. (2010). Forerunners of Romance *-mente* adverbs in Latin prose and poetry. In E. Dickey & A. Chahoud (Eds.), *Colloquial and literary Latin* (pp. 339–353). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byloo, P., Kastein, R., & Nuyts, J. (2007). On *certainly* and *zeker*. In M. Hannay & G. J. Steen (Eds.), *Structural-functional studies in English grammar: In honour of Lachlan Mackenzie* (pp. 35–57). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Company Company, C. (2012). Condicionamientos textuales en la evolución de los adverbios en *-mente*. *Revista de Filología Española*, 92(1), 9–42. doi:10.3989/rfe.2012.v92.i1.235
- Cornillie, B. (2008). On the grammaticalization and (inter)subjectivity of evidential (semi-)auxiliaries in Spanish. In E. Seoane & M. J. López-Couso (Eds.), *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization* (pp. 55–76). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cornillie, B. (2016). Acerca de la locución epistémica *tal vez* en el Siglo de las Luces: innovación y especialización. In M. Guzmán & D. Sáez (Eds.), *Márgenes y centros en el español del siglo XVIII* (pp. 183–199). Valencia: Tirant Humanidades.
- Delbecque, N. (2009). Acerca de la relación entre *cierto* y *seguro*. In M. Veyrat Rigat & E. Serra Alegre (Eds.), *La lingüística como reto epistemológico y como acción social. Estudios dedicados al Profesor Ángel López García con ocasión de su sexagésimo aniversario* (Vol. 2, pp. 629–644). Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Diewald, G. (2002). A model for relevant types of contexts in grammaticalization. In G. Diewald & I. Wischer (Eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization* (pp. 103–120). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Downing, A. (2008). From transparency to opacity: *Surely*, intersubjectivity and English cultural norms. In M. J. Lorenzo Modia (Ed.), *Proceedings*

- 31st AEDEAN Conference (pp. 677–687). A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2183/17081>
- Espinosa Elorza, R. M. (2010). *Procesos de formación y cambio en las llamadas “palabras gramaticales”*. San Millán de la Cogolla: Cilengua.
- Espinosa Elorza, R. M. (2014). Adverbios de cantidad, foco, polaridad y modalidad. In *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española. Tercera parte: Preposiciones, adverbios y conjunciones. Relaciones interoracionales* (Vol. 1, pp. 939–1115). México, D. F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México / Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- González Manzano, M. (2010). Subjetivización y unidireccionalidad en la evolución histórica del adverbio *verdaderamente*. *Res Diachronicae*, 8, 7–27. Retrieved from <https://resdi.net/volumen-viii/>
- González Manzano, M. (2013). Gramaticalización por subjetivización y persistencia de significados etimológicos: Sobre la consolidación de *realmente* como marcador del discurso. In E. Casanova Herrero & C. Calvo Rigual (Eds.), *Actas del XXVI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y de Filología Románicas* (Vol. 3, pp. 145–156). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hummel, M. (2013a). Attribution in Romance: Reconstructing the oral and written tradition. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 34(1), 1–42. doi:10.1515/flih.2013.001
- Hummel, M. (2013b). La dimensión intercultural de la expansión diacrónica de los adverbios en *-mente*. In M. P. Garcés Gómez (Ed.), *Los adverbios con función discursiva: procesos de formación y evolución* (pp. 15–41). Madrid / Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana / Vervuert.
- Hummel, M. (2018). Romance sentence adverbs in *-mente*: Epistemic mitigation in synchrony and diachrony. *Linguistik online*, 92(5), 111–144. doi:10.13092/lo.92.4507

- Lewis, C. T., & Short, C. (1879). *A Latin dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- López-Couso, M. J. (2010). Subjectification and intersubjectification. In A. H. Jucker & I. Taavitsainen (Eds.), *Historical pragmatics* (pp. 127–163). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- López-Couso, M. J., & Méndez-Naya, B. (2014). From clause to pragmatic marker: A study of the development of *like*-parentheticals in American English. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 15(1), 36–61. doi:10.1075/jhp.15.1.03lop
- López-Couso, M. J., & Méndez-Naya, B. (2016). From clause to adverb: On the history of *maybe*. In G. Kaltenböck, E. Keizer, & A. Lohmann (Eds.), *Outside the clause: Form and function of extra-clausal constituents* (pp. 156–176). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mariño Paz, R. (2008). *Historia de la lengua gallega*. Munich: Lincom.
- Míguez, V. (2019). On (un)certainty: The semantic evolution of Galician *seguramente*. In C. Pinon (Ed.), *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics 12* (pp. 217–246). Paris: CSSP. Retrieved from <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss12/>
- Monteagudo, H. (1999). *Historia social da lingua galega. Idioma, sociedade e cultura a través do tempo*. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Nuyts, J. (2001). *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pietrandrea, P. (2008). *Certamente* and *sicuramente*: Encoding dynamic and discursive aspects of commitment in Italian. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 22(1), 221–246. doi:10.1075/bjl.22.11pie
- Rodríguez-Espiñeira, M. J. (2019). La expresión epistémica *si cuadra* en español de Galicia. *Estudos de Lingüística Galega*, 11, 197–231. doi:10.15304/elg.11.5343

- Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M., & Aijmer, K. (2007). *The semantic field of modal certainty: A corpus-based study of English adverbs*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Suárez Hernández, A. (2018). *Análisis diacrónico de adverbios con función discursiva: hacia una descripción lexicográfica*. San Millán de la Cogolla: Cilengua. Retrieved from <https://www.cilengua.es/tienda/historia-de-la-lengua>
- Suzuki, D. (2018). The semantics and pragmatics of modal adverbs: Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of *perhaps*. *Lingua*, 205, 40–53. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2017.12.014
- Taavitsainen, I., & Jucker, A. H. (2010). Trends and developments in historical pragmatics. In I. Taavitsainen & A. H. Jucker (Eds.), *Historical pragmatics* (pp. 3–30). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Traugott, E. C. (1989). On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language*, 65(1), 31–55. doi:10.2307/414841
- Traugott, E. C. (2003). From subjectification to intersubjectification. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *Motives for language change* (pp. 124–139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E. C. (2007). (Inter)subjectification and unidirectionality. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 8(2), 295–309. doi:10.1075/jhp.8.2.07clo
- Traugott, E. C. (2014). On the function of the epistemic adverbs *surely* and *no doubt* at the left and right periphery of the clause. In K. Beeching & U. Detges (Eds.), *Discourse functions at the left and right periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change* (pp. 72–91). Leiden: Brill.
- Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E. C., & Trousdale, G. (2013). *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Villar Díaz, M. B. (2013). La evolución de los adverbios y locuciones adverbiales de modalidad epistémica. In M. P. Garcés Gómez (Ed.), *Los adverbios con función discursiva: procesos de formación y evolución* (pp. 158–199). Madrid / Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana / Vervuert.
- Villar Díaz, M. B. (2016). *Hablemos ciertamente*. Historia e historias de combinatoria léxica adverbial desde la perspectiva de la lexicografía histórica. In R. Cotelo García (Ed.), *Entre dos coordenadas: la perspectiva diacrónica y diatópica en los estudios léxicos del español* (pp. 367–390). San Millán de la Cogolla: Cilengua.
- Yelin, B., & Czerwionka, L. (2017). *Capaz* and *quizás* in Argentine Spanish: Epistemic adverbs with mood variability. *Hispania*, 100(1), 30–46. doi:10.1353/hpn.2017.0003