

Marking the sources of knowledge, asserting the epistemic stance

Evidential strategies in Deharveng's Franco-Belgian language column *Récréation philologique et grammaticale* (1922–1928)

Franz Meier

University of Augsburg

At the beginning of the 20th century, the Jesuit priest Joseph Deharveng (1867–1929) was one of the main representatives of a language correction movement based essentially on the standard Parisian model of French. Deharveng's goal was to clear the practices of French-speaking Belgians of everything which seemed to deviate from this supposed 'good usage' of French. Under the evocative title *Corrigeons-nous!*, Deharveng published six anthologies from 1922 to 1928 reproducing the articles published in his language column "Récréation philologique et grammaticale" in the Brussels newspaper *La Jeunesse*. The present study addresses how Deharveng makes use of evidential markers, that is, linguistic features to express the sources of knowledge in his language column. The distribution of evidential markers in Deharveng's column is compared to those in two other Franco-Belgian language columns published by Albert Doppagne (1912–2003) from 1960 to 1987 in the Brussels newspaper *Le Soir* and by Michel Francard (1952–) from 2018 to 2022, also in *Le Soir*. The aim of this comparison is to discern author-specific and language ideology-driven similarities and differences in the patterning of evidential strategies in language columns.

Keywords: evidentiality, language columns, language ideologies, French-speaking Belgium

1. Joseph Deharveng and his work as a language columnist

A professor of rhetoric at the Collège Saint-Michel in Brussels, the Jesuit Joseph Deharveng (1867–1929) played a decisive role in the development of the language correction movement in French-speaking Belgium during the interwar period

(Klinkenberg 1985, 745). Under the evocative title *Corrigeons-nous!*, he published six anthologies from 1922 to 1928 (Deharveng 1922–1928) reproducing the articles published in his language column “Récréation philologique et grammaticale” in the weekly Brussels newspaper *La Jeunesse. Hebdomadaire illustré pour la jeunesse belge* – a staunchly Catholic publication dedicated to the education and entertainment of teenage pupils and students: “Cette Revue publie les beaux contes de tous les pays, des chroniques de science, des pages amusantes pour les tout petits, des articles d’actualité à la portée d’un public de 10 à 18 ans, des concours et jeux d’esprit” (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 3, back cover page). As is typical for the discursive genre of language columns (Remysen 2005, 270–271), Deharveng often responds in his articles to questions from readers about the validity of particular usages and provides advice on the supposed correct or incorrect use of French. Deharveng’s work also includes the dictionary of language difficulties *Corrigeons-nous! Aide mémoire et additions* (Deharveng 1928) and the grammar book *Scrupules de grammairiens* (Deharveng 1929), which also reflect normative concerns.

All these publications helped to establish Deharveng’s authority in language issues among a broad public. His metalinguistic commentaries acted as a model for the grammars of Maurice Grevisse and André Goosse. For example, the latter acknowledges in his *Façons de parler* (1971) that “J’ai pour le Père Deharveng une admiration très vive et beaucoup de reconnaissance: c’est en partie à lui que je dois ma vocation de grammairien; et je ne suis pas le seul à dire cela” (Goosse 1971, 109). Thanks to his reputation as an educator and intellectual (Stenuit 2005, 551–552), as well as to the abundance and the meticulousness of his work, Deharveng’s beliefs about language have a prominent place among the discourses that have contributed to shaping the *imaginaire linguistique* (Houdebine 2002), or linguistic imagination, of French-speaking Belgians. Deharveng’s work reflects particular linguistic ideologies, that is, “a set of cultural notions in the anthropological sense: a frame, not always conscious or within awareness, through which we understand linguistic practices” (Gal 2006, 15). For Deharveng, these language ideologies include the notion that French-speaking Belgians must conform to the French normative model, that is, Standard French from France, and that this particular model is superior to others. Deharveng thus contributed to fuelling the conflicting, often self-deprecating relationship which French-speaking Belgians have long maintained with their own variety of French – a relation which can also be referred to as linguistic insecurity (Lafontaine 1991; Francard, Lambert, and Masuy 1993; Francard 1996; Moreau, Brichard, and Dupal 1999). As an advertising notice of one of the *Corrigeons-nous!* volumes puts it, Deharveng’s main intent is the condemnation of *belgicismes*, that is, the diatopic specificities of the French language used in Belgium:

L'auteur, Belge d'origine, a relevé chez ses compatriotes un certain nombre de tournures, de constructions syntaxiques, de prononciations d'un usage courant dans la conversation et les écrits. A propos de chacun de ces « belgicisms » il fait un petit cours de grammaire, chef-d'œuvre du genre. Il ne se contente pas de dire dites ceci et ne dites pas cela, écrivez ceci et non cela. Il fait appel à la raison, à l'usage, aux bons auteurs avec la meilleure grâce du monde. Il y a peu de lecture plus agréable et plus instructive que celle de ce petit livre vivant, spirituel, sans pédantisme. (Orion, December 1923)

Even though Deharveng adopts a deliberately conciliatory tone, which is common to most other Belgian language columnists (Klinkenberg 1985, 2000; Meier 2019, 2021; Dister 2021, 2022; Francard 2022), his work can undoubtedly be described as purist. Given his overall rejection of Franco-Belgian usages, it is interesting to note that Deharveng is not always resolutely prescriptive. He can also show an attachment to local expressions, particularly to those of his province of origin, the Hainaut (Goosse 1977, 349). In general, however, Deharveng does not view these usages as part of the supposed good use of French he wishes to promote. Therefore, his work conveys a normative hierarchy which is relatively complex and does not always follow clearly established criteria, as in the case of the following example, where he both accepts and condemns Franco-Belgian usages for aesthetic reasons. The use of this argument reveals Deharveng's highly subjective relationship with the practices of French-speaking Belgians:

« Aubette » à la Revue des Deux Mondes eût demandé un mot d'explication.

Très joli, quoique trop local. A garder dans le pays d'origine, selon la formule portative de Faguet, à moins que l'Académie de Richelieu ne consente à admettre ce mot et à le poinçonner.

Et, à parler franc, l'Académie devrait cela à l'amitié belge, qui est tout ardeur et toute dévotion pour le beau et lumineux parler des Bossuet, des Chateaubriand, des Veuillot, des Lemaître et des Maurras. Oui, « aubette », « drève » et quelques autres, les « Immortels » devraient les recevoir tout de suite, tant ces mots ont l'élégance et le sourire français.

Mais il est des belgicisms que jamais ils ne recevront, eux les suprêmes mainteneurs du pur langage et que, de mon côté, il nous faudrait proscrire impitoyablement. C'est, par exemple, tous ces mots français auxquels nous donnons une acception insolite et, qui par voie de conséquence inéluctable, sont et resteront les preuves d'une langue gauchie et déformée. Ainsi le mot *place* dans le sens de *pièce*. Combien de *places* y a-t-il au rez-de-chaussée ? Il y a quatre *places*. Mais, non, il y a quatre *pièces*. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 1, 207)

The importance assigned to France as a language model is reinforced by Deharveng's affiliation to the *Action française*, a nationalist, royalist, authoritarian and counter-revolutionary movement founded in France by Charles Maurras and

Léon Daudet, amongst others (Nolte 1961). Like many other right-wing Christian intellectuals who were reluctant to compromise with the democratic movements of the interwar period, Deharveng became an ardent admirer of the writings of Maurras (Stenuit 2005, 554–555).¹ The prescriptive discourse put forward by Deharveng in *Corrigeons-nous!* is a good example of an ideological initiative to not only promote linguistic beliefs, but to also validate political discourses. Maurras, who Deharveng describes as a “grand et illustre écrivain, un des meilleurs prosateurs de notre époque” (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 1, 18), is regularly cited, as he is considered to be “une très grande autorité” (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 1, 83). The nationalist conservatism conveyed by the *Action française* urges a conservative vision of the French language which hence must be preserved from any outside influences. For traditionalists like Deharveng, preserving the purity of the language therefore requires compliance with the French normative model.

In the present study, I examine lexical evidential markers and their discursive function in a sample of 25 articles published from 1922 to 1923 in Deharveng’s language column “Récréation philologique et grammaticale”. Language columns are particularly suitable for the study of evidentiality, since they represent a prototypical genre of lay linguistics (produced by experts and/or professionals in language issues and published for a broad audience which includes primarily non-specialists) in which the epistemic dimension is intertwined with argumentative strategies. In other words, the columnists position themselves with respect to the communicated linguistic knowledge, using a wide range of linguistic features. The present study addresses how Deharveng makes use of linguistic resources to express the sources of knowledge he uses to justify and legitimise his beliefs about language. These sources of knowledge include visual or auditory perception, reported information or logical inferences. I hold the position that the examination of evidential strategies reveals Deharveng’s attitude and commitment to the validity of the information conveyed in his discourse. The study of evidential strategies may thus indicate the linguistic ideologies that underlie Deharveng’s discourse. The distribution of evidentials in Deharveng’s work is compared to the ones in two other Franco-Belgian language columns published by Albert Doppagne (1912–2003) from 1960 to 1987 in the Brussels newspaper *Le Soir* and by Michel Francard (1952–) from 2018 to 2022, also in *Le Soir*. The aim of this contrastive approach is to discern author-specific and language ideology-driven similarities and differences in the patterning of evidential strategies in language columns.

1. The influence of far-right ideas on Deharveng’s linguistic imaginary would certainly warrant further analysis. For the present study, this aspect is however left aside.

2. Evidentiality and epistemic stance in discourse

Drawing on Boye and Harder (2009, 6), *evidentiality* refers to a “cognitive or functional substance phenomenon”, encoded by linguistic means that fulfil the function of “the marking of the source of the speaker’s knowledge” (Haßler 2018, 87). The concept is well-known; Sapir (1921, 108–109) mentions “the source, or nature, of human knowledge” alongside other grammatical concepts. Initial research on evidentiality was mainly centred on languages which have an obligatory grammatical category to indicate the speaker’s information source, for example Tuyuca, an indigenous language in Colombia (Barnes 1984). More recently, however, scholars have emphasised the importance of studying evidentiality in languages which, like French, do not have obligatory morphological markers for this category (Dendale and Van Bogaert 2007; Dendale and Izquierdo 2014; Squartini 2008; Haßler 2014). Studies on evidentiality in French adopt a functional-onomasiological perspective to identify the wide range of lexical, syntactic and morphological means by which evidential meanings are expressed (Dendale and Van Bogaert 2012). While evidentiality is a popular category in the field of discourse pragmatics, the study of evidentials in specific genres, text types or discursive domains, such as in scientific texts (Katelhön 2001; Grossmann and Tutin 2010; Hidalgo-Downing 2017) or journalistic texts (Marín Arrese 2015, 2017) is less prolific. My contribution seeks to provide further insights into a usage-based account of evidential strategies in discourse.

In the present study, I assume an inclusive conception of evidentiality, that is, an approach which defines evidentiality and epistemic modality as mutually related phenomena. Following Marín Arrese (2015, 211), *epistemic modality* “is conceived as ‘epistemic support’ and involves notions such as ‘degree of certainty’ and ‘degree of commitment’”. As convincingly pointed out by authors such as Anderson (1986) and Boye (2012), evidentiality and epistemic modality are complementary subcategories of the same superordinate category, namely *epistemic stance*, that is, the “positioning of the speaker with respect to their assertions and their commitment to the validity of the proposition” (Marín Arrese 2015, 211). Hence, the concept of evidentiality does not refer to the mere marking of the speaker’s source of knowledge. In fact, it can also be defined more generally as a stance-taking resource which allows the speaker to evaluate a propositional content, to position him/herself and to express alignment or disalignment:

Defined narrowly, evidentiality pertains to the sources of knowledge or evidence whereby the speaker feels entitled to make a factual claim [...]. But evidentiality may also be conceived more broadly as both providing epistemic justification and reflecting [the] speaker’s attitude towards the validity of the communicated infor-

mation, and [the] hearer’s potential [acceptance] of the information, derived from the degree of reliability of the source and mode of access of the information.
(Marín Arrese, Haßler, and Carretero 2017, 1–2)

To determine how Deharveng uses evidential markers in his language column, I follow Katelhön (2001), who adapts the taxonomy proposed by Willett (1988) to examine evidential markers in German scientific articles (see also Meier and Schwarze 2021). I distinguish two superordinate domains, namely direct evidentiality, which is first-hand information through sensory perception of the speaker, and indirect evidentiality, which is non-personal information reported by others or acquired by means of inferencing claims. With regard to the marking of the information source in discourse, Katelhön (2001) provides a classification which she conceives as a continuum of evidential strategies which can overlap. Figure 1 presents the evidential categories of my scheme of analysis, which is an adaptation of Katelhön’s taxonomy.

Evidential categories						
Direct evidentiality		Indirect evidentiality				
Sensory perception (A)		Reportative evidence (B)			Inferential evidence (C)	
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Visual perception (A1)	Auditory perception (A2)	Second hand (B1)	Third hand (B2)	Reported tradition (B3)	Deduction (C1)	Induction (C2)

Figure 1. Taxonomy of evidential categories

Direct evidentiality includes markers which indicate visual sensory perception (A1) and auditory sensory perception (A2). Other types of sensory evidence, as proposed by Katelhön (2001), are not relevant for the present study, since they do not occur in my data. Like in Katelhön’s taxonomy, indirect evidentiality is based on reported information (B), which can be second-hand (B1) with explicit indication of the source (author, title, page, etc.), third-hand (B2) with reference to an unspecified source (*les linguistes, les grammairiens*, etc.) or knowledge which derives from cultural, linguistic or discursive traditions (*on sait que ..., il est généralement admis que ..., etc.*) (B3). Moreover, indirect evidentiality includes markers which make reference to conceptual-based inferences (C). Following Katelhön (2001), these markers signal deductive processes which start from a conclusion based on objective knowledge (C1) or inductive processes, that is, general-

isations based on the observation of particular cases (C2). In contrast to Katelhön (2001), no further categories of indirect inferential evidentiality, namely markers of conviction (*je suis convaincu(e) que ...*) and belief (*je crois que ...*), are postulated. In my data these markers express both deductive (C1) and inductive processes (C2) and were classified as such.

3. Lexical evidential markers in Deharveng's language column

3.1 Method and data

Following Meier and Schwarze (2021), the present study focuses on the use of lexical evidential markers and adopts both a *theory-driven* (top-down) and a *corpus-driven* (bottom-up) approach. On the one hand, I examine lexical items which are prototypical for the marking of evidentiality in French, for example perceptual, epistemic and modal verbs (*voir, paraître, devoir*, etc.) or stance adverbs (*évidemment, apparemment*, etc.) (Gomez-Imbert 2003; Dendale and Van Bogaert 2007; Haßler 2014). On the other hand, the analysis is guided by the lexical markers found in the examined material (e.g. *verba dicendi*). To ensure the comparability of the results obtained with previous research which also focuses on lexical evidentials (Meier and Schwarze 2021), morpho-syntactic evidential markers (Barbet and de Saussure 2012), such as the *conditionnel journalistique* (Dendale 2014) have not been taken into account.

The sample of texts taken for the quantitative analysis (Section 3.2.1) includes 25 articles of Deharveng's language column "Récréation philologique et grammaticale" published in *La Jeunesse* from December 1922 to September 1923 and included in volume 2 of *Corrigeons-nous!*. All the articles are approximately of equal length (1,560 words), forming a corpus of roughly 39,000 words. The time period of the sample covers the early phase of Deharveng's activity as language columnist. However, the sample is considered to be representative of Deharveng's entire work, since throughout its entire period of publication his column shows a high degree of homogeneity in terms of the structure of the articles and the explicit prescriptivism conveyed.

For the discussion of the quantitative results (Section 3.2.2), I draw on comparable data from research in Meier and Schwarze (2021), based on material from two other Franco-Belgian language columns, published across two time periods. The sample includes 25 articles from "La Chronique du langage", produced by Albert Doppagne and published from 1960 to 1987 in the Brussels newspaper *Le Soir* and 25 articles from "Vous avez de ces mots...", produced by Michel Francard and published from 2018 to 2019, also in *Le Soir*. These articles form a cor-

pus of roughly 48,000 words. While Doppagne follows an overall prescriptive approach and holds rather conservative positions, focusing on what he considers to be deviations from the use of French inventoried in dictionaries and grammars (Meier 2021), Francard proposes a more neutral description of linguistic practices (Francard 2022). Moreover, the two columnists have different professional profiles. Doppagne is a professor of Spanish philology and art history, whereas Francard is a professor of French sociolinguistics.

3.2 Results and discussion

3.2.1 *Types and distribution of evidential forms*

The results in Table 1 reveal an unbalanced distribution of the three evidential value types in the sample of articles from Deharveng’s language column. The data show a high occurrence of reportative evidential markers, which indicates a strong presence of viewpoints and assessments attributed to text external voices. In contrast, direct evidentials and indirect inferential evidentials are much less frequent.

Table 1. Distribution of evidential types A, B and C in Deharveng’s language column

	Direct evidentiality (type A)	Reportative evidentiality (type B)	Inferential evidentiality (type C)
%	7.6	85.0	7.4
(N)	(39)	(436)	(38)

The results show significant differences in the frequencies between the sub-categories of each evidential type. With regard to the distribution of direct evidentiality markers (type A), Deharveng more frequently refers to what he has seen or read, for example in newspapers or literary works (type A1) than to what he has heard, for example in the streets of Brussels or other Belgian cities (type A2).

Table 2. Distribution of type A evidence markers

	Visual sensory perception (A1)	Visual auditory perception (A2)
%	82.1	17.9
(N)	(32)	(7)

The preferred markers for direct evidence are perception verbs such as *entendre* (‘to hear’) and *lire* (‘to read’), which are prototypically associated with the two domains of sensory perception under study. The columnist generally uses

these verbs in the first person singular to express that he provides direct first-hand evidence, as in (1) and (2). However, there are also instances, where Deharveng includes himself in a heterogeneous and ‘unlimited’ collective (Fløttum, Dahl, and Kinn 2006, 247). In these cases, the verbs co-occur with the third person pronoun *on*, which refers to a community of speakers whose members potentially have direct sensory access to the information provided by Deharveng, as illustrated in (3) and (4):

- (1) Les chaleurs du mois de juillet m'ont fait réfléchir, et, sur de bonnes raisons, je dois me raviser. A tous les paliers de Bruxelles, **voici ce que j'ai entendu**: « Je ne *sais* plus manger... Je ne *sais* plus dormir... Je ne *sais* plus respirer... tant il fait chaud! »
(*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 131)
- (2) **Voici une note que je lis dans le cahier d'un élève venant d'un collège des Flandres**: « *De retour*, sauf dans l'expression *je suis de retour*, etc., est un flandricisme. C'est la traduction littérale du mot flamand *terug*. Par conséquent ne dites plus: Il m'a donné mon livre *de retour*. Je veux avoir mon argent *de retour*. Mais dites: Il m'a rendu mon livre. Je veux ravoir mon argent. »
(*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 168)
- (3) Dans un journal belge, **il y a des chances pour que l'on déniche**, à tout coup, des choses comme celles-ci: « La crue de la Haine est particulièrement grave. A Mons les digues de la Trouille sont d'inégale hauteur. Les prairies du côté de Cuesmes, Quaregnon, Saint-Ghislain, Jemappes, Hornu ne forment plus que d'immenses étendues d'eau de 0.80 à 1 mètre de profondeur. Les terrains sont tellement détrempés que cette eau ne SAIT plus s'écouler [...] ». – *Libre Belgique*, 2–3 janvier 1920.
(*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 155)
- (4) « Est-ce que tu *connaiss* tes leçons? J'ai été puni parce que je *connaissais* pas le *Songe d'Athalie*. » **Impropriétés de mots que de ce poste d'observation l'on est sûr de voir défil**er, au milieu d'un carnaval d'autres pataquès: « Je ne *puis mal* de faire cette punition... Qu'est-ce que *c'est pour* une balle?... »
(*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 147)

In Examples (1) to (4), the expression of direct evidence by means of perception verbs functions as a comment on the propositional content of the utterance. Additionally, I find occurrences of evidential sentences (*phrases évidentielles*, Dendale and Van Bogaert 2012), that is, utterances whose predication exclusively centres on the way in which the columnist accessed particular sources of knowledge, dealing with the underlying process of information elaboration. In evidential sentences, the indication of the source of information becomes the very object of the predication, as in the following two examples:

- (5) **En lisant le *Bulletin bibliographique et pédagogique du Musée belge*, un mot m'a stupéfié à la lettre.** C'est dans le compte rendu de l'ouvrage posthume de Kurth, intitulé: *Le Guet-apens prussien de 1914*. Je transcris: « Il (Kurth) éructe les pensées les plus élevées et les sentiments les plus nobles pour *flageller* la cruauté et la duplicité de l'Allemagne. » (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 121)
- (6) **Aussi bien les files d'exemples apparaissent dans le champ de ma mémoire.** Je n'ai qu'à piquer dans le tas. A Cuesmes, près de Mons, le 31 octobre 1921, long arrêt du train allant à Quiévrain par Flénu. Le train de Chimay est en retard. Mes compagnons de voyage en prennent leur parti: ... (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 79)

Interpreted in the light of Anderson's (1986) definition of evidential markers as linguistic means which appear in an utterance and indicate the source of information provided in that utterance, evidential sentences cannot be considered as evidentials in a narrow sense. But since the purpose of the present study is more pragmatic than grammatical, my aim is to describe the whole spectre of linguistic means used by Deharveng to manage what Kronning (2012, 83) calls the author's "responsabilité épistémico-énonciative". Evidential sentences were therefore included in the analysis. Other sensory markers, for example nominal phrases denoting the organs, that is, eyes and ears, with which sensory perceptions are made, are also documented in the material. Nonetheless, as (7) illustrates, these expressions do not have direct evidential meaning and were discarded:

- (7) Excusez-moi d'infliger à **vos yeux** le supplice de ce vilain mot. – Le mal se fait sentir jusque parmi les étudiants de nos Universités. (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 67)

The markers of direct evidentiality found in my data are shown in Table 3, which also gives the absolute frequency of each type of marker in brackets. The results show that the expression of direct first-hand evidence is restricted to a limited number of verbs. It is worth pointing out that, in the sample, *voir* is not used as a perception verb. It is also interesting to note that, within each perceptual subcategory, a clear preference can be observed for one marker, while all others display a rather limited number of tokens. These results seem to point to a high degree of stylistic uniformity in Deharveng's discourse.

Table 3. Absolute frequency of direct evidentiality markers (type A)

Visual sensory perception (A1)
<i>lire</i> (22), <i>rencontrer</i> (7), <i>trouver</i> (2), <i>dénicher</i> (1), <i>découvrir</i> (1)
Auditory sensory perception (A2)
<i>entendre</i> (6), <i>étudier</i> (1)

As far as the frequency of reportative evidentials is concerned (type B), the results in Table 4 show an unequal distribution of the three subcategories established in Section 2:

Table 4. Distribution of type B evidence markers

	Second-hand (B1)	Third-hand (B2)	Reported tradition (B3)
%	90.3	4.6	5.1
(N)	(394)	(20)	(22)

The figures reveal that second-hand reported information (B1) is overwhelmingly frequent in the sample under study. Deharveng shows a strong tendency to give an explicit indication of the source of information to which he refers. Where he introduces authentic quotations from a previous speech or written document, this is always done by providing precise bibliographical references in brackets, including – where possible – the name of the author, the title of the cited document, its edition and the page. What is emblematic of Deharveng's texts is the inclusion of quotations from a broad range of literary and journalistic sources. Apart from the source indication, these multiple instances of reported discourse are generally not contextualized by speech reporting verbs or expressions. This is illustrated in (8) below, where Deharveng comments on the use of the verb *investiver*:

- (8) L'usage l'a abolie, l'usage des meilleurs prosateurs du XIX^e siècle.

L. Vuillot: Il investissait les siffleurs. – *Odeurs de Paris*, neuvième édition, p. 163.

J. Lemaître: Elle commence par investiver son frère. – *Impressions de Théâtre*, t. VII, p. 314.

Sorel: La reine qu'il investive. – *L'Europe et la Révolution française*, t. VII, p. 108.

Sainte-Beuve: Il investissait le tyran. – *Causeries du Lundi*, t. IV, p. 146.

Barrés: Il l'investive. – *Au service de l'Allemagne*, édition illustrée, p. 70.

Bordeaux: Pour investiver ce sorcier... – *La Peur de vivre*, édition de famille, p. 51.

Remy de Gourmont: Il (Barbey) prononce des discours, investive le peuple. – *Promenades littéraires*, 1^{re} série, p. 271.

René Doumic: Fureur du petit qui investive sa mère. – *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 mai 1917, p. 452. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 56)

Moreover, I regularly find instances of direct speech presentation, whose source is precisely indicated, but which lack clear demarcation signals, that is, quotation marks. In these cases, the distinction between reporting discourse and reported discourse is not always evident. (9) is an illustration of this phenomenon:

- (9) Autre exemple du verbe *découper* bien employé : Au lieu de trouver Joachim Trémery, comme d'habitude à cette heure du jour, parcourant sa correspondance ou *découpant* des revues (il jetait au fur et à mesure, au fond d'une corbeille à papier, d'où son secrétaire avait mission de les tirer ensuite, les pages susceptibles de l'intéresser), je le surpris au jardin allant et venant. – **Edmond Jaloux**, *La Fin d'un Beau Jour*, p. 28. (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 8)

Source indications are also provided when Deharveng uses more indirect modes of reporting. However, these types of discourse representation generally correlate with less complete source indications, thus highlighting the notion that Deharveng does not focus on the source's discourse itself, but on his own reporting discourse, which he foregrounds as a second discourse in relation to that of the source's. For example, when Deharveng identifies overlaps and discrepancies between different reference books, such as dictionaries, he only mentions the name of the dictionaries taken into consideration, but he refrains from providing any further bibliographic information, as in (10) below:

- (10) Oui, mon colonel, ou colonel – faut-il dire *mon* colonel ou colonel tout court? – oui, vous avez raison. **Littre, Larousse, l'Académie** disent *un entrecôte* et **l'Académie** donne comme exemple : *un bon entrecôte*. Toutefois le **dictionnaire de Hatzfeld et Darmesteter** nous dit : le mot est souvent féminin, dans l'usage familial. En souvenir de vous, mon colonel, je dirai toujours : J'ai mangé un bon entrecôte, c'est-à-dire un morceau de viande coupé entre deux côtes. Le mot doit être du masculin. (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 54)

Examples (11) and (12) show that markers of second-hand reported information are often combined with markers of direct evidentiality, mostly with the verbs *lire* ('to read') and *rencontrer* ('to encounter'):

- (11) Corneille a dit : « Ton bras est invaincu, mais non pas invincible ». C'est vrai. Mais « invincible » officiellement n'est pas français... Il ne l'est que depuis quelques jours. **Je lis aujourd'hui dans la Croix des Jeunes Gens, 16 septembre 1923** : « L'Académie vient enfin d'admettre « invincible » aux honneurs de son dictionnaire. La plupart des admirateurs du grand Corneille s'étonneront d'apprendre que ce mot n'était pas français [...]. » (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 166)

- (12) *Renseigner*, en ce sens, est un belgicisme. Voyez la première série de *Corrigeons-nous*. Il faudrait dire: signaler, indiquer. **Cette faute, depuis 1921, je la rencontre partout.** « Renseignez-nous le nom de vos amis. – *Revue catholique des Idées*, 10 novembre 1922, p. 3. – Non, il faut dire: signalez-nous, indiquez-nous... (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 10)

As illustrated in Table 4 above, the other two subcategories of type B are less frequent. Third-hand reporting of an unspecified source (B2) often occurs when the language columnist makes generic reference to reference books and literary writers, as in Example (13), or to other authors who can be seen to have some sort of language ‘competence’, as in (14).

- (13) Humour. *Un* ou *une*? **Tous les dictionnaires disent: *un*; mais beaucoup d’écrivains excellents disent: *une*.** (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 92)
- (14) N’écoutez pas **les grammairiens qui affirment que *pour de bon*** n’est pas français. Pas français une expression employée par Veuillot, Lemaître, Maurras et Daudet, et le succulent Farfadet! Aussi bien l’expression *pour de bon* est déjà consignée au dictionnaire de Hatzfeld et Darmesteter. A plus tard, mes preuves et mes exemples. Ce sera une averse, une giboulée! (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 14)

Slightly more frequent are reportative evidential markers of type (B3) which refer to knowledge which is part of cultural or linguistic traditions, as illustrated in Examples (15) to (17).

- (15) *Un* ou *une*? Apogée? **Tout le monde sait que *hypogée***, terme par où l’on désigne un tombeau égyptien, est du masculin. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 49)
- (16) **On sait que** tout candidat à l’Académie doit faire visite à tous les *Immortels*. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 58)
- (17) Et que d’autres exemples l’on pourrait vous citer. Mais il ne faut pas que la sauce, **dit un proverbe**, inonde le poisson. Le poisson, en l’espèce, c’est la règle fixant l’usage de *savoir* et de *pouvoir*. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 79)

Despite Deharveng’s strong tendency to introduce quotations without any further contextualisation, my analysis shows that numerous quotations are nonetheless reproduced in the form of direct or indirect speech together with reporting verbs, that is, *verba dicendi*. Even though I find a broad range of speech reporting verbs in the sample of articles, the results in Table 5 illustrate that the preferred verbal markers for reported evidence are *écrire* (‘to write’) and *dire* (‘to say’). The high figures for both verbs bring further evidence for a high degree of stylistic uniformity in Deharveng’s column. It is also interesting to note the frequent use of parenthetical *écrire*, as illustrated in (18), where the reporting clause figures as an

‘island’ in the reported discourse. In these instances, the lexical meaning of *écrire* is reduced to a mere functional meaning, that is, the indication of indirect evidence (Remberger 2018).

- (18) « On veut, écrit Maurras – *Action française*, 22 juin 1920 – on veut solenniser dans trois mois l'échéance de cette honte. Qu'à cela ne tienne!... Si le cinquantenaire de ce principe approche et qu'il *plaise* de le fêter, nous n'y voyons que des avantages... »
(*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 43)

Other typical markers of reported evidence are prepositional phrases, as in (19), which in my data are significantly less frequent than *verba dicendi*, as shown in the results in Table 5.

- (19) Oh *le* bel et sémillant anagramme! Car, au XVI^e siècle, anagramme était du masculin. De nos jours, il est du féminin; mais, **au dire de Littré**, c'est une faute assez commune de faire anagramme du masculin.
(*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 89)

Table 5. Absolute frequency of indirect reportative evidentiality markers (type B)

Verba dicendi
<i>écrire</i> (82), <i>dire</i> (34), <i>citer</i> (11), <i>continuer</i> (9), <i>affirmer</i> (6), <i>parler</i> (5), <i>signaler</i> (4), <i>ajouter</i> (4), <i>apprendre</i> (4), <i>condamner</i> (2), <i>consigner</i> (2), <i>rapporter</i> (2), <i>raisonner</i> (1), <i>formuler</i> (1), <i>faire remarquer</i> (1)
Epistemic verbs
<i>savoir</i> (6), <i>paraître</i> (1)
Prepositional phrase
<i>suivant</i> (8), <i>selon</i> (7), <i>d'après</i> (5), <i>au dire de</i> (4)

With regard to indirect inferential evidentiality (type C), the material reveals the predominance of deductive inference (C1), as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Distribution of type C evidence markers

	Deduction (C1)	Induction (C2)
%	57.9	42.1
(N)	(22)	(16)

To mark inferential values, Deharveng uses perceptual verbs such as *voir* ('to see') or *constater* ('to notice') or verbs that explicitly denote the internal cognitive processes in question, such as *conclure* ('to conclude'). In my data, there appears to be a certain preference for the use of *sembler* ('to seem') and *paraître* ('to appear')

to express inferential evidence. These two verbs combine with different syntactic configurations. Both occur in raising constructions as in (20) and (21). *Sembler* is also found in sentences with complement clauses ('sembler+ QUE' construction), as in (22), and parenthetical expressions, as in (23), where Deharveng uses the evidential marker to delegitimise other discourses of authority, namely those conveyed by grammatical works.

- (20) Et le « si pas »? L'usage français y semble tout à fait réfractaire. Voilà plus de vingt ans que je le cherche dans un écrivain français. Un chétif exemple tiré de Bourget et c'est tout. – *Eau profonde*, p. 24G. **La grammaire historique et l'usage semblent donc conspirer à justifier l'arrêt de proscription**: Ne dites pas: Cela est utile, *si pas* nécessaire; mais dites: Cela est utile, *sinon* nécessaire. (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 113)
- (21) Ceux qui ont lu les admirables articles de Jacques Boulenger sur la *Grande Pitié de la Langue Française* (*Opinion*, 23 mars 1923, etc.), savent que J. Boulenger est, avec Marcel Boulenger, un des plus vigilants défenseurs de la grammaire. **La cause me paraît donc entendue**. *Pour de bon* est du meilleur français. (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 178)
- (22) *Avoir aise, avoir facile*, l'un est presque la réplique de l'autre. Et malgré l'autorité de Veuillot, un des tout premiers prosateurs du XIX^e siècle au dire de J. Lemaître, **il me semble que l'un et l'autre sont à rejeter**. La raison, c'est que le verbe *avoir*, ainsi employé, a quelque chose d'insolite, d'apprêté, de guindé presque; oseriez-vous dire: *vous aurez commode* de voir le Roi d'Espagne, quand il viendra à Bruxelles? (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 38)
- (23) D'après les grammairiens, *pour de bon* serait à rejeter. Seuls *tout de bon* et *pour tout de bon* seraient français. **Ce jugement doit être cassé, me semble-t-il**. Je reconnais qu'au XVII^e siècle *pour de bon* est introuvable. *Tout de bon* dans le sens de: véritablement, sérieusement, d'une manière définitive, est fort employé. (*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 175)

A limited number of tokens of the cognitive verb *croire* ('to believe') have indirect-inferential value. Following the analysis proposed by Cappelli (2007) for the English verb *believe*, some uses of *croire* have affective-evidential meaning, since it can be assumed that the speaker, at least, is convinced of the veracity of the propositional content he/she conveys. In (24), Deharveng delivers evidential justification of language change phenomena, that is, the increasing use of the lexeme *apaisement*, referring to his own observations. The predicate *croire* thus marks the inferential assumption made by Deharveng on the grounds of his own perceptual sensory evidence.

- (24) **Je crois que** c'est pendant la guerre que le mot *apaisement*, avec son acception belge, a pris son vol en France. Ce n'est pas le seul. Avant la guerre, je ne l'avais rencontré qu'une seule fois, et encore l'auteur, M. René Pinon, l'avait mis entre guillemets. Il n'est pas difficile, écrivait-il en 1911, de deviner en quoi pourraient consister, en pareil cas, les « apaisements » de la Roumanie. – *L'Europe et la jeune Turquie*, p. 415. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 18)

With regard to the stance adverb *évidemment* ('apparently', 'obviously'), given that it expresses inferential evidentiality (Haßler 2014, 2018), it is sometimes used to support inferred claims on the supposed correct or incorrect use of French, as in (25). Moreover, the adverb *simplement* ('simply', 'just') is occasionally used to denote inferences based on a common ground, that is, "information which is mutually known to be shared in communication and continuously modified in communication" (Krifka 2008, 245), as in the case of (26). In the sample, *simplement* utterances always represent an uncomplicated and obvious solution to a linguistic problem. However, this solution appears obvious only to Deharveng, while he assumes that this is not necessarily the case for his readers. From this perspective, *simplement* utterances help the language columnist to show causal relations which he considers as not being immediately self-evident to his public.

- (25) « Jusque leur chemise », c'est **évidemment** une faute de grammaire. Les Français disent et écrivent « jusqu'à leur chemise » et c'est le texte qu'on peut lire dans le grand ouvrage d'Albert Sorel: *L'Europe et la Révolution française*, t. I, p. 338. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 167)
- (26) *Informé que* est très français. Mais ce qu'il faut bannir c'est la lourde et horrible expression: *Je vous informe de ce que*. Comme M. Laroche a raison de proscrire tous ces mots qui alourdissent et empâtent la pensée: *Je demande à ce que*. Mais dites **donc simplement**: *Je demande que*. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 171)

Table 7 lists the markers of indirect inferential evidentiality according to their absolute frequency in the sample of articles.

Table 7. Absolute frequency of indirect inferential evidentiality markers (type C)

Perceptual, epistemic, cognitive and modal verbs
<i>sembler</i> (8), <i>conclure</i> (7), <i>croire</i> (3), <i>paraître</i> (3), <i>voir</i> (2), <i>pouvoir</i> (2), <i>devoir</i> (2), <i>constater</i> (2)
Stance adverbs
<i>évidemment</i> (6), <i>simplement</i> (3)

3.2.2 *Deharveng's evidential strategies in contrast*

This section provides a discussion of the quantitative results presented in Section 3.2.1. In order to discern author-specific and language ideology-related features in the pattern of preferences for values of evidentiality, I compare the distribution of the markers of the three evidential types in Deharveng's column with the distributions determined in Doppagne's and Francard's column (Meier and Schwarze 2021). The comparison of the figures in Table 8 indicates that all three authors show a clear preference for indirect reportative values of evidential expressions, relying overwhelmingly on non-personal, external mediated forms of access to knowledge, while markers of direct evidence and indirect inferential evidence are significantly less frequent.

Table 8. Distribution of evidential types A, B and C in Franco-Belgian language columns

	Date of sample	Direct evidentiality (type A)	Reportative evidentiality (type B)	Inferential evidentiality (type C)
%		9.4	79.7	10.9
(N)		(72)	(614)	(84)
Deharveng	1922–1923	7.6 (39)	85.0 (436)	7.4 (38)
Doppagne	1977–1981	22.2 (28)	57.9 (73)	19.9 (25)
Francard	2018–2019	3.8 (5)	81.2 (105)	15.0 (21)

Despite these general similarities, which suggest a typical genre-related patterning of evidential expressions in Franco-Belgian language columns, the figures in Table 8 need to be analysed in greater detail, in order to explore specific author-related and language ideology-driven differences of evidential marking in argumentative style. This is discussed in the following for each evidential type.

Type A: The data reveal a dissymmetry in the occurrence of direct evidence in the three language columns. There is a high occurrence of direct evidentials in Doppagne's column, while the sample of Deharveng's texts displays an overall lower frequency. Being both representatives of the Franco-Belgian language correction movement, Deharveng and Doppagne often state that they have direct access to information when referring to language usages that do not conform to the prescriptive norm. A connection can thus be found between the marking of direct

evidence and the ‘standard language ideology’ (Milroy and Milroy 1987), which can be defined as the conviction that only usages which comply with the prescriptive norm may be considered as legitimate. While Deharveng focuses on ‘deviant’ usages in the written language, mainly in the literature produced by highly-regarded writers, as in (27), Doppagne deals with linguistic corrections of written and especially spoken language, referring often to particular usages detected in the audiovisual media, for example in television, as in (28). The marking of direct evidentiality reflects thus not only technological progress, but also a growing interest in the informal and oral uses of French. In contrast, the indication of direct evidentiality is almost absent in Francard’s column, where the author neutrally describes usages, without stigmatizing language variation, as in (29). One can thus suppose that in my material the presence or absence of direct evidentials mirrors first and foremost the language ideological stance adopted by the three columnists.

- (27) *Un ou une? Argile? Dans ce livre admirable de M. Paul Crokaert, dans L’Immortelle mêlée, je lis à la page 293 : « Le sable de la grande dune se mêle à l’argile gris du polder ». C’est une tache dans cette belle et mâle prose. Hélas! tous les écrivains sont pétris de la même argile, tous les écrivains sont faillibles. Argile est du féminin. Argile grise... (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 50)*
- (28) Dans le commentaire parlé d’un film documentaire sur Venise, j’ai été fâcheusement surpris d’entendre parler de la « Vénitie » pour désigner la région de Venise.
(Doppagne, “La Chronique du langage”, *Le Soir*, 1 November 1977)
- (29) Recevoir un zéro à l’examen se disait donc *een bros krijgen* du côté de la KUL, mais **on entendait aussi ramasser une brosse** à l’UCL.
(Francard, “Vous avez de ces mots...”, *Le Soir*, 15 February 2019)

Type B: An explanation for the overall high frequency of reportative evidential markers can be found in the definition of language columns as a lay linguistics genre which addresses a broad audience, including readers who are not experts in language issues. Following Hidalgo-Downing (2017), the strong presence of viewpoints and evaluations attributed to external voices is a typical property of popularization texts, whose authors need to legitimise their claims by making reference to a source of authority, in order to guide their audience and to introduce and signpost important information. Such an interpretation appears to be particularly valid

for the columns produced by Deharveng and Francard, who assign a preponderant weight to quotatives, while the results in Doppagne's column show that providing epistemic justification by means of external sources is less of an absolute priority. Regarding the use of reportative evidentials in discourse, further differences can be discerned in terms of the language columnists' ideological stance. While Francard's descriptive approach correlates with the use of reportative evidentials to illustrate or explain a point, as in (30), Doppagne's and Deharveng's prescriptive intent correlates with the use of reportative evidentials to justify particular usages. This is clearly illustrated in (31), where Deharveng, as so often, makes reference to Maurras (Stenuit 2005, 554–555), thereby normalizing not only preferred linguistic variations of French, but also validating implicitly the nationalist discourse put forward by *Action française*.

- (30) Nombre de pléonasmes sont installés depuis longtemps dans la langue. Le tour car en effet, par exemple, est attesté dès l'époque classique (**Le bon usage**, 2016, § 374 b);
(Francard, "Vous avez de ces mots...", *Le Soir*, 7 June 2019)
- (31) Si je voulais énumérer les écrivains qui ont employé *là contre*, je devrais dénombrer toute l'élite des prosateurs français. Je me bornerai à vous en citer trois: J. Lemaître, P. Bourget et Charles Maurras. [...]
Charles Maurras – L'Action Française, 24 octobre 1922: *Là contre* que ferait le journal tout seul? **Ibidem**, 20 janvier 1923: Plus d'un sot s'est raidi *là contre*.
Là contre est donc bien français et il serait téméraire de vouloir réagir ou de penser à se rebeller *là contre*.
(*Corrigeons-nous!*, vol. 2, 129)

Type C: Author-related disparities can also be discerned with regard to the indication of inferential evidence, as both Doppagne and Francard more frequently provide epistemic justification by marking internal cognitive processes than Deharveng does. The comparison reveals, on the one hand, a greater presence of the internal authorial voice expressed through inferential evidentials in Doppagne's and Francard's texts. On the other hand, Deharveng's articles combine a certain backgroundedness of the authorial voice with a high number of authentic quotations. Deharveng's column hence conveys a more expository discourse, while Doppagne and Francard follow a more persuasive approach. In all three columns, markers of conceptual-based inferences legitimize claims of

authority by making reference to logical reasoning, implying that the author's viewpoints are credible and convincing, since they are based on a common ground of knowledge which is supposed to be accessible to all readers. In other words, the marking of the author's internal cognitive processes alludes to the intersubjective comprehensibility of the information provided. Highlighting logical inferences therefore represents an important evidential strategy in popularization texts such as language columns, as illustrated in the Examples (32) to (34). Unlike types A and B, due to the supposed universal validity and comprehensibility of the marked propositional contents, in all three language columns no clear correlation can be drawn between the presence of indirect inferential evidentials and the language ideological stance of the columnists.

- (32) Aujourd'hui au lieu de *couteau à papier*, on dit fort bien : *coupe-papier*. *Coupe-papier* et non: *découpe-papier*. **Preuve évidente** qu'il faut dire : *couper* un livre. (Corrigeons-nous!, vol. 2, 12)
- (33) Une collection d'expressions s'offre à nous quand nous voulons dire, de façon plus ou moins imagée ou détournée, que quelqu'un est riche. C'est **naturellement** le verbe *avoir* qui, le premier, sera mis à contribution.
(Doppagne, "La Chronique du langage", *Le Soir*, 21 May 1980)
- (34) À côté de ces dénominations « officielles », on trouve quelques variantes **manifestement** inspirées par le souci de s'inscrire dans l'une ou l'autre des filières de dérivation existantes. Tel ce trentagénnaire, sans rapport avec un ancêtre latin direct, mais créé par analogie – et sans doute par hypercorrectisme – avec les formes se terminant par -agénnaire.
(Francard, "Vous avez de ces mots...", *Le Soir*, 16 February 2018)

4. Conclusion

This paper has explored the presence and distribution of lexical evidential expressions in Deharveng's language column, adopting a contrastive approach to examine author-related and language ideology-driven features in the patterning of evidential strategies in language columns. The results indicate that Deharveng uses a rather limited set of prototypical evidential expressions, which point to a high degree of stylistic uniformity in the columnist's discourse. The results thus

largely confirm the findings of previous, theoretically oriented studies on lexical evidentiality markers in French. The study of Deharveng's texts has also revealed preferences for certain evidential value types, especially those of type B. The high occurrence of indirect reportative evidentials is consistent across other Franco-Belgian language columns from more recent periods and sheds light on the functional character of language columns as popularization texts. However, the use of reportative evidentials is particularly pronounced in Deharveng's column, involving a highly frequent occurrence of authentic and sometimes very long quotations, which are often listed one after the other, thereby underlying the largely expository character of Deharveng's discourse. The results also show a certain impact of the language ideological background on Deharveng's choice of evidential strategies, especially those of type A and B, which point to the need of the columnist to mark explicitly his prescriptivist stance. This is done in a twofold manner: firstly by justifying the stigmatization of supposed bad uses of French by means of first-hand direct sources of knowledge and secondly, by legitimizing the use of supposed good usages of French by externally mediated forms of access to reported knowledge.

The results indicate that, despite the rather limited size of the examined material and the preliminary layout of the contrastive study, typical author-specific uses of evidential markers can be identified in the discourse of language columnists. This case study illustrates the potential relevance of a broader investigation of the use of other stance-taking resources in language columns. In this context, markers of deontic stance seem to be particularly interesting, since the columnists often explicitly display how authoritative or powerful they are with regard to the supposed correct or incorrect use of French relative to their readers, thus imposing how the latter can, should, must or must not speak or write.

Funding

Open Access publication of this article was funded through a Transformative Agreement with University of Augsburg.

References

- Anderson, Lloyd. 1986. "Evidentials, Paths of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically Regular Asymmetries." In *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, ed. by Wallace Chafe, and Johanna Nichols, 273–312. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Barbet, Cécile, and Louis de Saussure. 2012. "Présentation: Modalité et évidentialité en français." *Langue française* 173: 3–12.

- doi** Barnes, Janet. 1984. "Evidentials in the Tuyuca Verb." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 50: 255–271.
- doi** Boye, Kasper (ed.). 2012. *Epistemic Meaning. A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- doi** Boye, Kasper, and Peter Harder. 2009. "Evidentiality: Linguistic Categories and Grammaticalization." *Functions of Language* 16: 9–13.
- Cappelli, Gloria. 2007. *"I reckon I know how Leonardo da Vinci must have felt..." Epistemicity, Evidentiality and English Verbs of Cognitive Attitude*. Paris: Pari Publishing.
- Deharveng, Joseph. 1922–1928. *Corrigeons-nous! Récréations philologiques et grammaticales*. 6 volumes. Brussels: Félix (vol. 1)/Dewit (vol. 2–6).
- Deharveng, Joseph. 1928. *Corrigeons-nous! Aide mémoire et additions*. Brussels: Dewit.
- Deharveng, Joseph. 1929. *Scrupules de grammairiens*. Brussels: Dewit.
- doi** Dendale, Patrick. 2014. "Le conditionnel de reprise: apparition en français et traitement dans les grammaires du XVI^e au XX^e siècle." In *Médiativité, polyphonie et modalité en français: études synchroniques et diachroniques*, ed. by Jean-Claude Anscombe, and Evelyne Oppermann-Marsaux, 243–260. Paris: Presses Sorbonne nouvelle.
- Dendale, Patrick, and Dámaso Izquierdo. 2014. "Les marqueurs évidentiels ou médiatifs en français: une approche bibliographique." *Cahiers de lexicologie* 105: 79–97.
- Dendale, Patrick, and Julie Van Bogaert. 2007. "A Semantic Description of French Lexical Evidential Markers and the Classification of Evidentials." *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 19 (1): 65–89.
- doi** Dendale, Patrick, and Julie Van Bogaert. 2012. "Réflexions sur les critères de définition et les problèmes d'identification des marqueurs évidentiels en français." *Langue française* 173: 13–29.
- Dister, Anne. 2021. "André Goosse, chroniqueur de langage." In *Les idéologies linguistiques: débats, purismes et stratégies discursives*, ed. by Carmen Marimón Llorca, Wim Remyssen, and Fabio Rossi, 271–290. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.
- Dister, Anne. 2022. "Maurice Grevisse et André Goosse: du bon usage au français universel." *Cahiers internationaux de sociolinguistique* 21 (2), 129–145.
- doi** Fløttum, Kjersti, Trine Dahl, and Torodd Kinn. 2006. *Academic Voices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Francard, Michel. 1996. "Un modèle en son genre: le provincialisme linguistique des francophones de Belgique." In *Français régionaux et insécurité linguistique*, ed. by Claudine Bavoux, 93–102. Université de la Réunion: L'Harmattan.
- Francard, Michel. 2022. "Heurts et bonheurs d'un chroniqueur de langue." *Cahiers internationaux de sociolinguistique* 21 (2): 45–50.
- Francard, Michel, Joëlle Lambert, and Françoise Masuy (eds.). 1993. *L'insécurité linguistique en Communauté française de Belgique*. Brussels: Service de la langue française/Communauté française Wallonie-Bruxelles.
- doi** Gal, Susan. 2006. "Migration, Minorities and Multilingualism: Language Ideologies in Europe." In *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*, ed. by Clare Mar-Molinero, and Patrick Stevenson, 13–27. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Gomez-Imbert, Elsa. 2003. "Voir et entendre comme sources de connaissances grammaticalement explicites". In *Langues et cognition*, ed. by Claude Vandeloise, 115–132. Paris: Hermès Science Publications.
- Goosse, André. 1971. *Façons de parler*. Gembloux: Duculot.
- Goosse, André. 1977. "Qu'est-ce qu'un belgicisme? Communication de M. André Goosse lors de la séance mensuelle du 10 septembre 1977". *Bulletin de l'Académie royale de langue et de littérature françaises* LV (3–4): 345–367.
-  Grossmann, Francis, and Agnès Tutin. 2010. "Evidential Markers in French Scientific Writing: the Case of the French Verb *voir*". In *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*, ed. by Gabriele Diewald, and Elena Smirnova, 279–307. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Haßler, Gerda. 2014. "Adverbes épistémiques dans le français parlé et écrit: *apparemment, évidemment, visiblement, éventuellement, probablement*". In *Diskursmarker, Konnektoren, Modalwörter. Marqueurs du discours, connecteurs, adverbess modaux et particules modales*, ed. by Waltraud Weidenbusch, 161–174. Tübingen: Narr.
-  Haßler, Gerda. 2018. "Evidential and Epistemic Sentence Adverbs in Romance Languages". *Linguistik online* 92: 87–109.
-  Hidalgo-Downing, Laura. 2017. "Evidential and Epistemic Stance Strategies in Scientific Communication. A Corpus Study of Semi-formal and Expert Publications". In *Evidentiality Revisited. Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse-pragmatic Perspectives*, ed. by Juana Marín Arrese, Gerda Haßler, and Marta Carretero, 225–248. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Houdebine, Anne-Marie. 2002. "L'Imaginaire Linguistique et son analyse". *Travaux de Linguistique* 7: 11–27.
- Katelhön, Peggy. 2001. "Evidentialität in wissenschaftlichen Texten". In *Modality in Specialized Texts. Selected Papers of the 1st CERLIS Conference*, ed. by Maurizio Gotti, and Marina Dossena, 341–357. Bern: Lang.
- Klinkenberg, Jean-Marie. 1985. "La crise des langues en Belgique; note sur la Belgique néerlandophone." In *La crise des langues*, ed. by Jacques Maurais, 93–146. Québec/Paris: Conseil de la langue française/Le Robert.
- Klinkenberg, Jean-Marie. 2000. "Le français en Belgique." In *Histoire de la langue française. 1945–2000*, ed. by Gérald Antoine, and Bernard Cerquiglini, 701–718. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
-  Krifka, Manfred. 2008. "Basic Notions of Information Structure." *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55 (3): 243–276.
-  Kronning, Hans. 2012. "Le conditionnel épistémique: propriétés et fonctions discursives." *Langue française* 173: 83–97.
- Lafontaine, Dominique. 1991. *Les mots et les Belges*. Bruxelles: Ministère de la Culture: Service de la langue française.
-  Marín Arrese, Juana. 2015. "Epistemicity and Stance: A Cross-linguistic Study of Epistemic Stance Strategies in Journalistic Discourse in English and Spanish." *Discourse Studies* 17 (2): 210–225.
-  Marín Arrese, Juana. 2017. "Multifunctionality of Evidential Expressions in Discourse Domains and Genres. Evidence from Cross-linguistic Case Studies." In *Evidentiality Revisited. Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse-pragmatic Perspectives*, ed. by Juana Marín Arrese, Gerda Haßler, and Marta Carretero, 195–221. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- doi** Marín Arrese, Juana, Gerda Haßler, and Marta Carretero. 2017. "Evidentiality Revisited." In *Evidentiality Revisited. Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse-pragmatic Perspectives*, ed. by Juana Marín Arrese, Gerda Haßler, and Marta Carretero, 1–9. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- doi** Meier, Franz. 2019. "Diatopismes et degrés de normativité dans le discours sur le français en Belgique au tournant du 21^e siècle. Analyse d'une chronique de langage de Cléante." In *Les discours de référence sur la langue française*, ed. by Anne Dister, and Sophie Piron, 253–282. Brussels: Presses de l'Université Saint-Louis.
- Meier, Franz. 2021. "The Argument from Authority in Doppagne's Franco-Belgian Language Column: Polyphonic Interplays and Construction of Epistemic Authority." In *Authoritative Discourse in Language Columns: Linguistic, Ideological and Social Issues*, ed. by Carmen Marimón Llorca, and Sabine Schwarze, 117–140. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.
- Meier, Franz, and Sabine Schwarze. 2021. "Strategie evidenziali nelle cronache linguistiche: uno studio corpus-based in area francofona e italoфона. [Evidential strategies in language columns: A corpus-based study in the francophone and italoophone space]." In *Les idéologies linguistiques: débats, purismes et stratégies discursives*, ed. by Carmen Marimón Llorca, Wim Remysen, and Fabio Rossi, 369–396. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.
- Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. 1987. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*. London: Routledge.
- Moreau, Marie-Louise, Huguette Brichard, and Claude Dupal. 1999. *Les Belges et la norme: analyse d'un complexe linguistique*. Bruxelles: Service de la langue française (ministère de la Communauté française)/Duculot.
- Nolte, Ernst. 1961. "Die Action française." *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 9 (2): 124–164.
- Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2018. "Dice ha sentito dire che dicono... – la serialità locutiva in italiano [Dice ha sentito dire che dicono... – locutionary serialization in Italian]." In *Configurazioni della serialità linguistica. Prospettive italo-romanze*, ed. by Ludwig Fesenmeier, and Martin Becker, 129–149. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Remysen, Wim. 2005. "La chronique de langage à la lumière de l'expérience canadienne-française. Un essai de définition." In *Les journées de linguistique. Actes du 18^e colloque 11–12 mars 2004*, ed. by Julie Bérubé, Karine Gauvain, and Wim Remysen, 267–281. Québec: Centre interdisciplinaire de recherches sur les activités langagières.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York, Harcourt: Brace.
- doi** Squartini, Mario. 2008. "Lexical vs. Grammatical Evidentiality in French and Italian." *Linguistics* 46 (5): 917–947.
- Stenuit, Bernard. 2005. "Joseph Deharveng (1867–1929)." In *Les Collèges jésuites de Bruxelles. Histoire et pédagogie 1604–1835–1905–2005*, ed. by Bernard Stenuit, 551–555. Namur: Editions Lessius.
- doi** Willett, Thomas. 1988. "A Cross-linguistic Survey of the Grammaticization of Evidentiality." *Studies in Language* 12 (1): 51–97.

Address for correspondence

Franz Meier
Philologisch-Historische Fakultät
Universität Augsburg
Universitätsstraße 10
86135 Augsburg
Germany
franz.meier@philhist.uni-augsburg.de

Publication history

Date received: 1 May 2023

Date accepted: 20 August 2023