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Abstract

The present study builds on the evidential overtones of the main verbs of physical perception (visual) VER and SEE taking DECIR and SAY-reportive complements retrieved from a self-compiled Google corpus in Spanish and English. This opens up for research the possibility of a verdecir and seesay evidentiality in Spanish and English digital discourse. The analysis of the results confirms that the main verbs of direct vision VER and SEE take evidential values and provide justificatory support to the reported and quoted information provided by the DECIR and SAY post-complements based on the characteristics of the visual sources of knowledge, the meanings taken by the main perception verbs and the verbs of saying, and their complementation patterns of evidential perception.
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1. Introduction and structure of the article

The present study addresses evidentiality from a discourse perspective, drawing from Mushin’s (2012) approach to evidential strategies as ways to express some particular characteristics of a conceptualizer’s epistemic stance towards information – as more or less directly experienced, more or less certain, or more or less valid. Mushin (2013: 632) defends that “source of knowledge’ is not an adequate characterisation of the use of evidential forms in discourse”, but “a way of making the status of one’s knowledge ‘visible’ in discourse” (Mushin, 2013: 628; Rozumko, 2019: 2). She states that “all evidential usage must be understood in terms of how speakers position themselves with respect to the content of their talk” (Mushin, 2013: 635; Rozumko, 2019: 2), which, in Rozumko’s (2019: 2) words, relates evidential marking to concepts such as speaker authority, responsibility, and the right to know (Fox, 2001; Hanks, 2012; Sidnell, 2012).

Specifically, this study explores the evidential overtones of the Spanish VER and the English SEE-verbs of physical perception (visual) taking DECIR and SAY post-predicate reportive complements in a corpus comprising the visual (VER and SEE) + reportive (DECIR and SAY) expressions retrieved from the Google search engine in Spanish and English (henceforth, Spanish verdecir and English seesay expressions). Accordingly, the study examines how the verbs VER and SEE take evidential values and provide justificatory support to the quoted and reported information conveyed by their DECIR and SAY post-predicate complements in the expressions at issue.

The relationship of sight with the linguistic expression of knowledge has been studied extensively (Dundes 1972; Manns 1983; Danesi 1985, 1990; Tyler 1984; Ong 1991; Gallup and Cameron 1992; Sjöström 1999; Usonienė 2003; Yu 2004; Lien...
The extension of meaning in perception verbs is accepted by the academic community to be primarily complement-type-dependant (Ransom 1986; Sweetser 1993; Tasmowski 1989; Usonienë 2003; Verspoor 1996; Felser 1998; Dik and Hengeveld 1991; Duffley 1992; Brinton 2008). It is also accepted that the opposition of directness versus indirectness in complementation depends upon the post-predicate complementation and is parallel to the choice of the complementer introducing the clause (Usonienë 2003: 195), with finite complementation following verbs of perception associated with instances of indirect perception, which can be accompanied by evidential qualification (Chafe and Nichols 1986; Usonienë 2003; Woodbury 1986).

On this basis, yet going one step further, the present study draws from the hypothesis that main verbs of sight (VER and SEE) taking DECIR and SAY finite and non-finite reportive complements function as visual sources of direct information (Chafe and Nichols 1986; Woodbury 1986; Usonienë 2003; Marcos 2016) acquiring evidential values and expressing epistemological stance of direct visual perceptual experience, thus providing justificatory support to the quoted and reported information conveyed by their DECIR and SAY complements in the expressions at issue. In particular, VER and SEE are assumed to highlight the level of commitment — as more or less shared with the reader/hearer — for the validity taken by the actual conceptualiser of the information conveyed (Boye 2012; Nuyts 2017): Subjective-explicit ‘We see’ > Intersubjective-implicit ‘It is seen’ (Boye 2012; Marín-Arrese 2015, 2021; Nuyts 2017). Likewise, DECIR and SAY finite and non-finite reportive complements are assumed to index (inter)subjectivity, which depends on the level of responsibility, as more or less shared with the original conceptualiser, for the validity taken by the actual conceptualiser of the information conveyed. Therefore, the level of responsibility is expressed through complement choice, marking the explicitness of the original conceptualiser of the information quoted and reported — as more or less explicit if introduced by finite or non-finite complements. This is conditioned by marking the actual conceptualiser as more or less present when the original conceptualiser is uttering the information: ‘non-witness finite’ > ‘witness non-finite’ complements (Mushin 2013; Rozumko 2019) (Fig. 1).

This opens up for research the possibility of a verdecir and seesay evidentiality in Spanish and English digital discourse based on the characteristics of the visual sources of knowledge, the meanings taken by the main perception verbs and the verbs of saying, and the complementation patterns of evidential perception observed in the expressions at issue.

Following this introduction, the theoretical framework, the data, and the method guiding the analysis are described. Then, the examples of the Spanish verdecir and English seesay expressions retrieved from the Google corpus will be classified according to their finite and non-finite complement patterns of evidential perception (Whitt 2010), their visual sources of information, and their meanings. Finally, relative frequencies of distribution per hundred tokens will be quantified and contrasted for Spanish and English, and overall results will be discussed.

2. Theoretical framework for the analysis

The verbs of perception SEE and VER show significant frequencies of use and a crucial capacity to convey polyseymous meanings (Viberg 1983, 1984, 2001; Sweetser 1993; Schröder 1995; Harm 2000; Whitt 2010, 2011; Usonienë 2003). Etymological studies have long established that specific verbs of physical perception express non-physical meanings (Bechtel 1879; Kurath 1921; Buck 1949; Ibarretxe-Antunano 2002). Eve Sweetser (1993) was the first to re-analyse some semantic extensions of perception verbs in English. Sweetser (1993) and Harm (2000) highlighted those traces of non-physical internal perception that are commonly present even in verbs with a root meaning of physical perception. This supports the evidential uses of perception verbs seconded by Richard J. Whitt (2011: 348) in his typology of verbs of evidential perception (2010).
Whitt (2010) claims the domination of sight over the other senses and defends the crucial role of verbs of visual perception as carriers of evidential meaning.

Research has recently experienced an increasing interest in both the body’s and the environment’s role in cognition. The thesis of embodiment posits that cognition engages the brain and the body (Shapiro 2014), while extension and embedding expand cognition even further. In Stadnik’s synthesis (2015: 128), advocates of the extended mind thesis argue that elements of the environment often reduce the complexity of a cognitive task and even serve as components of the cognitive processes themselves (Robbins and Aydede 2008; Menary 2012). Exponents of the theory of distributed cognition defend that cognitive processes do not occur inside the agents’ heads but between the agents and the remaining components of the system (Hollan et al., 2000). Stadnik (2015: 128) concludes that the common ground appears to be that “language use and cognition are grounded in the speakers’ bodily and sociocultural experience” (Frank and Gontier 2010: 49) and, as a result, “the use of language can enable community members to engage in sharing perceptually-based knowledge” (Stadnik 2015: 128).

Mushin (2013) approaches evidential strategies from a discourse perspective and takes evidentiality into pragmatics-informed studies of social interaction, with speakers adopting a particular epistemological stance based on their source of information, the reasons or arguments that show the validity of information and the reliability of speakers, or their rhetorical intentions (Mushin 2001: 58; van Dijk, 2014: 274). For Mushin (Mushin 2001: 58), “what counts as ‘evidence’ is a trait of a human interaction”, which is becoming more digital every day. The textual or paradigm shift in the digital era (Bearne 2003) toward the prevalence of digital discourse based on multimodal texts (Kress 2003; Kress and van Leeuwen 1996; Cope and Kalantzis 2000) has affected the role of the reader, who has become a multiple reader-viewer navigator, interpreter, designer, and an interrogator (Kress 2010; Serafini 2012, 2014). In this vein, the Spanish verdecir and English seesay expressions analysed in the study take on a special significance in a digital discourse-based context.

Taking this preliminary information into consideration, the analysis raised in the present study revolves around three fundamental axes: (i) types of perception, (ii) typology of evidential perception verbs (+-say-complements), and (iii) reported and quoted sources of information:

(i) In 1983, Willems distinguished between direct and indirect physical perception and cognitive perception. Direct perception involves sight, hearing, or any other sense. Indirect perception requires an intellectual process; the perceived entity functions as a source of deductions and inferences for the perceiver. The subjects receive a particular stimulus by the senses and interpret such stimulus following their encyclopaedic knowledge of the world. Cognitive perception comprises deduction and intelligence without relying on external information. In line with Willems, Vespoor (1996) and Usoniene (2003) distinguish between direct and indirect perception, Ransom (1986) analyses direct physical perception as opposed to abstract cognitive evaluations, Dik and Hengeveld (1991) focus on immediate versus mental perception, and Sweetser (1993) differentiates between perceptually and mentally accessible entities.

(ii) Richard J. Whitt (2010) argues that the polysemy characterising perception verbs transfers over into the evidential domain so that one perception verb expresses a related set of evidential meanings (2010: 25). Whitt’s typology of evidential perception verbs comprises seven complementation patterns and two construction types:

1. Type I: Perception Verb (PV) + Finite Complement Clause (FCC)
2. Type II: PV + WH-Complement Clause
3. Type III: PV + Direct Object (DO) + Non-Finite Verb (NFV)
4. Type IV: PV + Prepositional Phrase (PP)
5. Type V: PV + Adjective (ADJ)
6. Type VI: PV + Conjunction (CONJ) + Clause (C)
7. Type VII: PV + Infinitive Copula (IC) + ADJ or Noun (N) or ADJ + N
8. Type VIII: Parentheticals
9. Type IX: Perception Verb External to the Clause (Whitt 2010)

In line with Whitt (2010), Albelda and Jansegers (2019) explain that one of the meanings that verbs of sight stand out is its evidential value. For the authors, “Physical sight serves as a source of evidence for both visual evidentiality (direct, what is seen by the physical eyes) and inferential circumstantial evidentiality (indirect)” (Albelda and Jansegers 2019: 76–77). However, Whitt’s ideas deviate from most typological studies on evidentiality encoded by grammatical markers, verbal affixes or modal auxiliaries (Chafe and Nichols 1986; Willet 1988; de Haan 1999; Aikhenvald 2003, 2004, among many others). Based on these studies, some of Whitt’s so-called complementation patterns should be reconsidered if they designated a state-of-affairs instead of a proposition (Boyé, 2012: 212).

(iii) Aikhenvald differentiates between reported and quoted evidentiality (2018: 12). She suggests a differentiation between direct (first-hand) and indirect (non-first-hand) evidentiality and subdivides indirect evidentiality into Inferred and Reported. Within the scope of firsthand evidentiality, she identifies visual and other kinds of perception. Regarding inferential

---

1 None of these ideas is uncontroversial. Critics complain that, at present, research results do not lend sufficient support to the theses of embodied and extended cognition, that the anti-representationalism and anti-computationalism of many of the new approaches seem unconvincing and premature, and that some positions are plagued by inconsistencies (Stadnik 2015: 128).
evidentiality, Aikhenvald separates perception (Squartini’s ‘circumstantialis’ 2001, 2008) and reasoning-based inference or assumption (Squartini’s ‘generics’ and ‘conjectures’ 2001, 2008; Willett 1988; Plungian 2001; Diewald and Smirnova 2010: 63). Her list of inferential values (Aikhenvald 2018: 12) comprises visual and non-visual sensory inference (from a visible or tangible result), assumption (not from a visible or tangible result but, e.g. from reasoning), reported and quoted.

Marín-Arrese (2021: 140) echoes Nuys’ (2017) argument that ‘Direct’ and ‘Reportive’ evidentiality are non-scalar, referring to the fact that they do not signal a high degree of confidence of the speaker regarding the evidence and, therefore, regarding the result of the inferential process triggered by the evidence. In this vein, direct evidential markers only indicate the mode of knowing and type of evidence (direct, sensory) (Nuys, 2017: 69), and reportive evidential resources only signal that the speaker has accessed the information indirectly, through communication with others (Nuys, 2017: 69). Nuys associates reported speech with the function of attribution of “the proposition to some external source” (Martin and White, 2005: 111); with an actual speaker/writer attributing information to someone else, thus disclaiming or distancing him/herself from reported and quoted contents (Mushin, 2001: 112; see also Aikhenvald, 2004: 132ff).

Despite this apparent objectivity, reporting also implies influencing readers’ positioning and shaping society’s position (Bakhtin 1986; Obedat, 2006; Smirnova 2009). Discourse studies of evidentiality focus on the choice of reporting expressions and the explicitness of the source of knowledge — associated with degrees of validity — that are used to communicate the speaker/writer’s epistemic authority over knowledge and the degree of responsibility taken for the validity or factual content of the information conveyed (Fox, 2001; Hill and Irvine, 1992; Sidnell, 2012). As Rozumko (2019) observes, evidential markers pointing to information sources have various pragmatic (inferred), context-dependent meanings and perform different interpersonal functions. Speakers and writers legitimate their utterances by adopting a particular (inter)subjective orientation based on contextual, social, and cultural knowledge, which is necessary to index participation (or lack of participation) in the information quoted or reported (Mushin 2001: 15; Marcos 2016).

On this basis, the verdecir and seesay expressions under analysis combine the expression of sensory evidence (indicating knowledge acquisition through direct sensory experience) with linguistic evidence (marking information acquired by hearsay or report), therefore mitigating the common association of reportive evidential forms with a speaker/writer claiming a lack of epistemic authority, not to take responsibility for the validity of the information quoted or reported. This can be seen in detail in the analysis of the results.

3. Data and method

The relationship between speech and writing has undergone significant changes over the past 120 years (Baron 2000). Writing is no longer the platform for defining standard language. The online and mobile technologies set the guidelines for reading, writing, speaking, and listening in today’s society. Today’s offline writing is much more casual than it was half a century ago (Thurlow 2006), as online writing is becoming part of the “emerging canon of trusted voices regarding communication in a digital world” (Baron 2011: xii).

On this basis, the data considered for the present analysis was retrieved from a self-gathered digital corpus that comprises all the Spanish ver and the English see markers of physical perception (visual) taking decir and say post-predicate complements that were obtained from the Google search engine through a random search including all the varieties of the two languages. This makes for a specialised corpus of analysis that amounts to 492 tokens distributed between 267 Spanish verdecir and 225 English seesay expressions.

To build on the evidential overtones of the Spanish verdecir and the English seesay expressions retrieved from the Google search engine, this article draws on previous research on visual perception and reportive evidentiality. The expressions under analysis were approached as instances of visual reportive evidentiality, which convey reported and quoted information (Willems 1983; Willet 1988; Plungian 2001; Squartini 2008; Diewald and Smirnova 2010; Marín Arrese 2013; Cornillie et al. 2015; Aikhenvald 2018). These expressions were mainly followed by the original speaker’s or writer’s words, reported (FCC in Tables 1–9) or quoted (QUOT in Tables 1–9).

Specifically, examples of first person singular/plural and impersonal complements were preselected for the analysis: ‘I/we see/have seen/saw sb say/saying/said’, ‘I/we see/have seen/saw that sb say/said’, ‘I/we see/have seen/saw that it is said’, ‘As I/we see/have seen/saw sb say/said’, ‘From what I/we see/have seen/saw they say/said’, ‘sb was seen saying’, ‘veo/vemos a alguien decir’ (‘I/we see sb say/saying’), ‘he/hemos visto que alguien ha dicho/dijo’ (‘I/we have seen that sb has said/said’), ‘veo/vemos/he visto/hemos visto que han dicho/dijeron’ (‘I/we see/have seen that they have said/said’), ‘veo/vemos/he visto/hemos visto decir’ (‘I/we see/have seen they/people say’), ‘se ve que dicen’ (‘it is seen/it seems that they say’), ‘se ve a alguien decir’ (‘sb is seen saying’), ‘como vemos decir’ (‘as we see sb say/people say’), ‘como he/hemos visto decir a alguno’ (‘as I/we have seen sb say/saying’), ‘como veo/vemos que han dicho’ (‘as I/we see that they have said’), ‘como he/hemos visto que ha dicho alguno/han dicho’ (‘as I/we have seen that sb has/they/people have said’), ‘como se ve decir a alguien’ (‘as we see sb say/saying’), ‘por lo que veo/vemos que han dicho’ (‘from what I/we see that they have said’), ‘por lo que veo/vemos decir’ (‘from what I/we see they/people say’), ‘por lo que se ve decir’ (‘from what it is seen

2 Only instances of entirely reported (FCC) and quoted (QUOT) information have been considered for the analysis. For methodological reasons, examples comprising a combination of reported and quoted information (FCC + QUOT) have not been considered. A complete list of abbreviations is provided at the beginning of the article. A list of the data sources and context of each of the examples is provided in a final Appendix at the end of the article.
that they/people say’), ‘según he/hemos visto que han dicho’ (‘from what I/we have seen that they/people have said’). No other previous selection regarding register, genre, chronological period, or variations of Spanish and English was made.

To meet the study’s research objectives, a combined qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data was performed. First, a context-based qualitative analysis was carried out to identify and classify instances of VER and SEE + DECIR and SAY expressions according to (i) the sources of visual information: sight, videos, images, online texts, and written texts published online; (ii) the meanings taken by VER, SEE, DECIR and SAY: see, hear, read, say, and write; and (iii) the complementation patterns followed by the expressions under analysis based on Richard J. Whitt’s (2010) typology of evidential perception verbs. The qualitative results obtained were then quantified and analysed. The (inter)subjective dimension was explored in line with the analysis of the structural patterns of these expressions, the characteristics of their visual sources of information and their meanings. Finally, the rates of relative frequency per hundred tokens were obtained for Spanish and English.

To ensure the validity of the qualitative analysis, the examples were addressed by two researchers who were native speakers of Spanish and English. Whenever doubts or disagreements regarding the identification of the sources of information and meanings arose, the participation of an impartial researcher was requested.

4. Results and analysis

Qualitative analysis of data revealed that vision, videos, and digital and written texts are the most frequent sources of information in the Spanish verdecir and English see/say expressions under analysis. The meanings conveyed by the verbs VER and DECIR and SEE and SAY are ‘read’ and ‘write’ (154 tokens) and ‘see’ and ‘say’ (71 tokens) in Spanish, and ‘read’ and ‘write’ (159 tokens) and ‘see’/‘watch’ and ‘say’ (82 tokens) in English. Complementation pattern Types I – Perception Verb (PV) + Finite Complement Clause (FCC) – and III – PV + Direct Object (DO) + Non-Finite Verb (NFV) – predominate in Spanish and English. Type IX – Perception Verb External to the Clause – is infrequent in the two languages.

4.1. Spanish – sources, uses and typologies

The Spanish verdecir expressions that take the information reported from direct sight tend to take the meanings ‘see’ and ‘say’ and are only found in Type III (PV + DO + NFV). Thus, VER retains its original meaning ‘see’ in the first example (1), before the writer reports or rephrases the original message as it is visually perceived. In example (2), VER introduces a quotation that reproduces the message of the original speaker, as perceived visually and auditorily. In the concatenation of evidential elements present in both examples, the elements of direct visual perception in the left periphery have a greater scope and dominate the report.

1. Oigo un golpe fuerte y la veo decir que no con la cabeza.
   *I hear a heavy blow and I see her say that she wouldn’t with her head.*

2. ‘Y mirándola le veo decir “adelante!”’
   *And looking at her I see her say “go ahead!”*

As revealed in Table 1, this use is infrequent in Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEE/SAY - SIGHT</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>FCC</th>
<th>QUOT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE III PV + DO + NFV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veo a alguien decir/</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le veo decir/see sb say/saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meanings ‘see’/‘watch’ and ‘say’ are adopted by Spanish verdecir expressions when the information reported is taken from video and image-based sources. In these cases, the preferred distribution pattern types are I, III and IX. Under Type I (PV + FCC), examples (3) and (4) show instances of reported information while (5) presents a quotative.

3. ... hoy por las noticias he visto que han dicho que se había aprobado.
   *... today on the news I have seen that they have said that it had been passed.*

4. ... en el primer capítulo de Flash se ve que dicen que en el 2024 flash desaparece.
   *... it can be seen in the first chapter of Flash that they say that Flash disappears in 2024.*

5. ... por ejemplo en el video se ve que dicen “Señor...”
   *... for example it can be seen in the video that they say “Lord...”*
Type III shows how the writer witnesses the original speaker uttering the words that he/she reports (6) or quotes (7, 8).

(6) Si vemos el video, tan solo le vemos decir que trabajan como cualquier otro trabajador...

(7) El clip en el que le vemos decir “Be water, my friend” corresponde a la llamada...

(8) “Queridos compatriotas, nuestra larga pesadilla nacional ha terminado”, se ve decir a Gerald Ford en su discurso inaugural de 1974, ...

Examples (9) and (10), under distribution pattern Type IX (PV + External), show that the writer uses both the impersonal form ‘como se ve decir’ (‘it is seen’) and the first-person plural form ‘como vemos decir’ (‘as we see say’) to either report (9) or quote (10) what he/she has watched and heard as a first witness.

(9) Un ‘viaje’, como se ve decir en ruso al instructor en el video, cuesta 300 rublos: siete euros y medio.

(10) Como vemos decir a una mujer en un mitin, “Cuando ella habla de su fe, se ve que es de verdad. Cuando ella habla de armas, se nota que es...

As we see a woman say in a speech, “When she talks about her faith, it is for real. When she talks about guns, it is...”

To disaggregate data, Table 2 reveals that Type III (PV + DO + NFV) is followed by 79.4% of the verdecir expressions retrieved from the Spanish Google corpus in a context of video and image-based viewing. Within Type III, it is worth noting that the expression ‘vemos un alquien decir algo’ (‘we see somebody say something’) is preferred in 51.8% of the cases, with 39.3% of its uses corresponding to non-literal reports, and 28.5% to literal quotations. In the same vein, the expression ‘hemos visto a alguien decir algo’ (‘we have seen somebody saying something’) is followed by 20.4% of the Type III examples, with 36.3% of its uses corresponding to non-literal reports and 18.1% to literal quotations. The impersonal expression ‘se ve a alguien decir algo’ (‘someone is seen saying something’) is always used to introduce quotatives and amounts to 26% of the total Type III verdecir expressions.

Within Type III (PV + DO + NFV), the predominance of the expressions ‘vemos un alquien decir algo’ (‘we see somebody say something’) (51.8%) and ‘hemos visto a alguien decir algo’ (‘we have seen somebody saying something’) (20.4%) unveils a preference for an intersubjective-explicit (witness non-finite) orientation. The level of responsibility for the validity taken by the actual conceptualiser/s is shared with the watchers/hearers (sensory evidence) and the original conceptualiser/s of the information conveyed (linguistic evidence), which is mainly quoted (44.4%).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATCH-SEE-HEAR/SAY - VIDEOS/IMAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE I PV + FCC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he visto que alguien ha dicho/l have seen that sb has said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se ve que dicen/it is seen/clear that they say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE III PV + DO + NFV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veo a alguien decir/see sb saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vemos a alguien decir/we see sb saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hemos visto a alguien decir/we have seen sb saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se ve a alguien decir/is seen saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE IX PV EXTERNAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>como vemos decir/as we see they/people say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>como se ve decir a alguien/as we see sb saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online sources of information comprise verdecir expressions that convey the meanings ‘read’ and ‘write’ and are distributed under the complementation Types I, III and IX in Spanish. In Type I, the writer reports the information that he/she has read by either referring to the message without reproducing the original writer’s words literally (11), or reporting them (12). Instances of quotatives are also retrieved from the corpus (13).

(11) … incluso he visto que ha dicho el día que el Madrid le ha citado para...

(12) Estoy contigo amigo en posts anteriores de Resax he visto que ha dicho que ha leído post tras post...

I agree with you, friend, in previous posts by Resax I have seen that he has said that he has read post after post...

3 According to Albelda (2016, 2018), Albelda and Jansegers (2019) and Jansegers and Albelda (2019), ‘se ve (que)’, when constructionalised, does not relate to physical vision but expresses evidentiality as its core meaning (i.e. it expresses the way in which the information was acquired). Perception verbs referring to visual and auditory perception modalities tend to foster discursive uses (Anderson 1986; Hanegreefs 2008; Fernández Jaén 2012; Tanghe and Jansegers 2014) which, very often, give rise to evidential markers through processes of grammaticalisation.
Type III comprises instances of an explicit original writer whose words are either evoked (14), or quoted by the online writer (15). Examples of impersonal reported expressions in which the original writer remains implicit are also retrieved from the Spanish corpus (16, 17).

As revealed by Table 3, Types I and III are commonly adopted by Spanish verdecir expressions that take the meanings ‘read’ and ‘write’ online texts, amounting to a total of 48.9% and 41.6% tokens, respectively. The predominance of Type I ‘he visto que han dicho’ (‘I have seen that they have said’) and Type III ‘veo un alguien decir’ (‘I see an unknown writer say’), shows a subjective orientation which is finite for Type I and non-finite for Type III. In both cases, the level of responsibility for the validity taken by the actual conceptualiser/s (sensory evidence) is shared with the original conceptualiser/s of the information conveyed (linguistic evidence), which is mainly reported (Type I, 74.6% vs 4.5%; Type III, 43.8% vs 8.8%).

As revealed by Table 3, Types I and III are commonly adopted by Spanish verdecir expressions that take the meanings ‘read’ and ‘write’ online texts, amounting to a total of 48.9% and 41.6% tokens, respectively. The predominance of Type I ‘he visto que han dicho’ (‘I have seen that they have said’) and Type III ‘veo un alguien decir’ (‘I see an unknown writer say’), shows a subjective orientation which is finite for Type I and non-finite for Type III. In both cases, the level of responsibility for the validity taken by the actual conceptualiser/s (sensory evidence) is shared with the original conceptualiser/s of the information conveyed (linguistic evidence), which is mainly reported (Type I, 74.6% vs 4.5%; Type III, 43.8% vs 8.8%).

Table 3
Read and write online texts, Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READ-WRITE - ONLINE TEXTS</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>FCC</th>
<th>FCC + QUOT</th>
<th>QUOT</th>
<th>CLAUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE I PV + FCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veo que han dicho/ see that they have said</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he visto que alguien ha dicho/ have seen that sb has said</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he visto que dicho/ have seen that they have said</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE III PV+(DO)+NFV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veo a alguien decir/ see sb say/saying</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vamos a alguien decir/ we see sb say/saying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veo/they decir/ have seen they/people say</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE IX PV EXTERNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por lo que veo que han dicho/from what i see that they have said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>como veo que han dicho/as I see that they have said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>como veo que han dicho/como I see that they have said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por lo que veo decir/from what i see that they have said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por lo que se ve decir/from what it is seen that they say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>como veo decir a alguno/as i have seen sb say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding printed sources of information published online, the most frequent meanings taken by the Spanish verdecir expressions are ‘read’ and ‘write’. Type I is frequently used to refer to a press report signed by an impersonal, unknown writer: (20) En los únicos periódicos que he visto que han dicho [tal news] es en los de València (Levant y Provincies), pero a nivel nacional… The only newspapers that I have seen that they have said such news are those from València (Levant and provinces), but nationally...

Type III (PV + DO + NFV) is adopted to evoke (21), report (22), or quote (23) the words of the original writer. This original writer functions as an explicit source of information in (21, 22, 23). This is not the case in (24, 25).

(21) …le he visto decir como cinco palabras distintas en los primeros dos tomos.
    … I have seen him say the five different words in the first two volumes.
As shown in Table 4, 94.1% of the total Spanish verdecir expressions meaning ‘read’ and ‘write’ and taking written texts as their source of information follow the Type III complementation pattern. Within this 94.1%, 81.3% of the examples correspond to the expression ‘vemos a alguien decir’ (‘we see somebody say/saying’). This points to an intersubjective-explicit (non-finite) conceptualiser that shares his/her responsibility with readers (sensory evidence), as much as with the original conceptualiser/s of the information conveyed (linguistic evidence).

Table 4
Read and write written texts. Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READ-WRITE - WRITTEN TEXTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE I PV + FCC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he visto que han dicho/i have seen that they have said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE III PV + DO + NFV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vemos a alguien decir/we see sb say/saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vemos/hemos visto decir/we see/we have seen they/people say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. English – sources, Uses and typologies

The English seesay expressions that take information from visual sources of information follow a Type III complementation pattern (PV + DO + NFV). As shown in Table 5, 43.7% of these seesay expressions comprise a quotative. In example (26), SEE retains its original meaning to introduce a quotative.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEE-SAY - SIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE III PV + DO + NFV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see sb say/saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seen sb say/saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I saw sb say/saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sb was seen saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(26) I rotated my head and saw them say “wow” in awe.

The English verb see takes the meanings ‘see’/’watch’ and ‘hear’ in seesay expressions in which the reported information is taken from a video or image-based source. In these cases, the preferred complementation pattern types are I and III.

Under Type I (PV + FCC), see takes the meanings ‘see’ and ‘hear’ to introduce the information reported (27) or quoted (28).

(27) I saw a video online and I saw they said you shouldn’t buy a crew with a prem tank.

(28) Many months ago I saw they said “the leading platform is PlayStation 3 and that is what we are building it around and expanding to others.”

Type III reveals how the writer watches the original speakers uttering the words that he/she evokes (29), reports (30), or quotes (31).

(29) I saw her say that in an interview that they showed on the news.

(30) I already saw her say she will do anything to keep him even knowing that he has a wife and child.

(31) When I saw them on Saturday Night Live and I saw them say, “What’s round on the ends and high in the middle?”

As shown in Table 6, Type III is used in 92.7% of the English seesay expressions in which see takes the meanings ‘see’/’watch’ and ‘hear’ video/images. Within Type III, the expression ‘I saw somebody say/said/saying’, which presupposes an intersubjective-explicit (witness non-finite) conceptualiser that shares his/her responsibility with readers (sensory evidence) and the original conceptualiser/s of the information conveyed (linguistic evidence), amounts to 47.3% of the total examples. No instances of Type IX distribution have been retrieved from the English corpus in this case.
Online sources of information comprise English seesay expressions that convey the meanings ‘read’ and ‘write’ and are distributed under complementation Types I and III. In the Type I expressions retrieved from the English corpus, the writer reports the information that he/she has read (32, 33).

(32) I see they say they found the pic in stronghold decorations so look it up there in your stronghold decorations and you will also find where it is…

(33) Developers vanished and I see they said they got bored, but were still charging for a game that looks to still be in beta.

In Type III, the actual online writer refers to the original writer of the words that are either reported (34) or quoted (35).

(34) On some sites online I have seen them saying they tow 3500—4000 lb behind campers and whatnot.

(35) And I’m tired of seeing them say “Tell them to Faen”…

As shown in Table 7, English seesay expressions meaning ‘read’ and ‘write’ in digital contexts are mainly distributed between Type I (42.7%) and Type III (56%). It is worth noting that 67.7% of the total Type I and 48.2% of the total Type III examples express reported evidentiality, whereas only 24.6% and 22.3% of the total Types I and III comprise quotatives. The Type IX retrieved from the English corpus amount to a significantly low 1.3% of the total expressions meaning ‘read’ and ‘write’. These include external markers, such as ‘judging from the things I have seen’ and ‘from what I saw they said’.

Table 7
Read and write online texts, English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>FCC</th>
<th>FCC + Quot</th>
<th>Quot</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I PV + FCC</td>
<td>I see that sb says</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see that sb said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I saw that sb said</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see (that) they say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see (that) they said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I saw (that) they said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see that it is said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III PV + DO + NFV</td>
<td>I see sb say/saying</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have seen sb say/saying</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I saw sb say/said</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sb was seen saying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IX PV EXTERNAL</td>
<td>Judging from the things I have seen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From what I saw they said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English seesay expressions with printed sources of information published online retain their meanings ‘read’ and ‘write’ in digital contexts. These expressions adopt the Type III complementation pattern to refer to an event reported by an unknown writer in an external source of information (36) and follow Type I to report (37) or quote the original writer (38).

(36) The first time I saw her say that was in a XXL article, I think, maybe back in 2007. So I reached out to her back then.

(37) Journeying back to the first paragraph once again, we see that it is said that after emancipation conditions for the slaves were not greatly…

(38) In the Old Testament we see that it is said of almost all the Jewish kings: *He did (or did not) like his father David did (or did not)*…
Table 8 reveals that 70.6% of the English seesay expressions meaning ‘read’ and ‘write’ written texts published online correspond to Type I, with the expression ‘We see that it is said’ amounting to 66.6% of the total examples. This reveals an intersubjective-explicit (finite) conceptualiser that shares his/her responsibility with readers (sensory evidence) and attributes to a written source or to general knowledge the original information conveyed (linguistic evidence). Meanwhile, Type III amounts to a low 23.5% of the total seesay expressions that mean ‘read’ and ‘write’ written texts published online. Instances of reported evidentiality double those of quotatives in Types I and III in English.

### Table 8
Read and write written texts. English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>FCC</th>
<th>FCC + QUOT</th>
<th>QUOT</th>
<th>CLAUSE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I PV + FCC</td>
<td>I see that sb said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I saw that sb said</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We see that it is said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III PV + DO + NFV</td>
<td>I saw sb say/said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IX PV EXTERNAL</td>
<td>As I saw sb say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To recapitulate, Type III is preferred in Spanish (79.4%) and English (92.7%) by the expressions meaning ‘see’/‘watch’/‘hear’ and ‘say’ and taking video and image-based sources of information. Within Type III, 44.4% and 42% of the total Spanish and English expressions, respectively, comprise quotatives. Reportives remain at lower levels in both languages (29.6% Spanish; 25% English). Type I follows far behind with 17.7% (Spanish) and 7.3% (English) of the total cases. Within Type I, the results obtained for reportives are much higher for English than for Spanish (83.3% and 58% of the total expressions in English and Spanish, respectively).

In the case of online sources of information, Type III is adopted by 41.6% and 56% of the total Spanish and English expressions. Meanwhile, Type I is followed by 48.9% and 42.7% of the total Spanish and English expressions, respectively. It is significant that instances of reportives amount to 43.8% and 63.7% of the total Type III Spanish and English expressions. This predominance continues to be the tendency in Type I expressions and amounts to 74.6% and 67.7% of the total examples in Spanish and English, respectively.

Significant differences between Spanish and English become apparent when written texts published online function as sources of information: Type III predominates in Spanish (94.1%) while Type I prevails in English (70.6%). Besides, examples of reportives double quotatives in English Type I (41.6% vs 16.6%, respectively) and Type III (50% vs 25%, respectively) expressions. No significant results were obtained for Spanish in this regard.

### 5. Discussion of overall results and conclusion

Table 9 shows normalised frequencies per hundred words to contrast overall results for Spanish VER and English SEE main verbs of physical perception (visual) taking DECIR and SAY finite and non-finite post-predicate complements.

### Table 9
Normalised frequencies per hundred words. Spanish and English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>SEE/SE W incubation (vision)</th>
<th>SEE/WATCH/SAVAY NTAGE</th>
<th>READ/WRITE – ONLINE TEXTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td>D. O</td>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>FCC + QUOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III PV + DO + NFV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I PV + FCC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III PV + DO + NFV</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IX PV EXTERNAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III PV + DO + NFV</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I PV + FCC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
Sight, videos, and digital and written texts are the primary sources of visual reportive — seesay — evidentiality in Spanish and English digital contexts according to the results obtained from the analysis of the 492 VER and SEE expressions which were retrieved from the Google corpus. The analysis of the results reveals a gradual change in the characteristics of the primary sources of visual information preferred by the verdecir and seesay expressions in Spanish and English digital discourse: online texts (27.8 Spanish vs. 30.9 English) are followed at some distance by video/images (13.8 Spanish vs 16.7 English), written texts published online (3.4 Spanish vs. 3.4 English) and direct sight (0.6 Spanish vs 3.2 English).

The primary meanings that are taken by VER and SEE in these expressions follow a parallel scale of continuous gradation in Spanish and English: ‘read’ online and written texts (31.1 Spanish vs 34.3 English) is followed at considerable distance by ‘see’/‘watch’/‘hear’ video/images (13.8 Spanish vs 16.7 English) and ‘see’ (0.6 Spanish vs 3.2 English). The same continuous gradation applies to the meanings taken by DECIR and SAY: ‘write' (31.2 Spanish vs. 34.3 English) is well ahead of ‘say’ (14.4 Spanish vs 19.9 English).

Visual + reportive verdecir and seesay expressions under analysis are distributed according to Richard J. Whitt (2010) finite and non-finite complementation patterns of evidential perception verbs. They follow Type I (Perception Verb (PV) + Finite
Complement Clause (FCC)), Type III (PV + Direct Object (DO) + Non-Finite Verb (NFV)) and Type IX (Perception Verb External to the Clause). Specifically, the results reveal that Type III is preferred in Spanish and English, although the ratio obtained for Spanish is lower (26.4 Spanish vs 36.8 English). Type I follows at some distance in both languages, with a similar ratio of 16.3 and 16.9 for Spanish and English, respectively. The results obtained for Type IX are almost non-existent for Spanish (3) and non-existent for English (0.6).

Also, it is worth noting that the English seesay expressions introduce more quotatives than the Spanish verdecir expressions, with a ratio of 15.6 for English, almost doubles the ratio obtained for Spanish (7.9). Quotatives tend to concentrate in Type III English (12) and, at some distance, Type III Spanish (7.1) expressions. Much lower ratios were obtained for Type I quotative expressions in English (3.6) and Spanish (0.8). This points to a predominance — more evident in English seesay than Spanish verdecir expressions — of an (inter)subjective non-finite orientation involving conceptualisers who share responsibility for the validity of the information conveyed with the original conceptualisers of the words quoted. In these cases, actual conceptualisers refer to original conceptualisers openly and quote their words literally instead of reporting them, so their commitment to the validity of the information conveyed is lower. A more significant presence of the original conceptualiser is proportional to the actual conceptualiser’s higher use of verbatim quotes and a lower degree of commitment.

The analysis of the overall results leads to significant conclusions which state further previous research supporting the claim that the directness of the main verbs of physical visual perception is affected by their say post-predicate complements (Chafe 1986; Woodbury 1986; Usoniene 2003). Expressly, these conclusions point out that not only finite Type I, but also non-finite Type III DECIR and SAY post-predicate complements add evidential overtones to the main VER and SEE verbs initially taking a basic meaning of visual physical perception in the Spanish verdecir and the English seesay expressions retrieved from the Google search engine. In finite Type I and non-finite Type III expressions, the verbs of direct perception VER and SEE retain their basic meaning of visual physical perception while taking evidential values to indicate a direct mode of access and provide justificatory support to the reported and quoted information provided by the DECIR and SAY post-predicate complements. It is worth noting, however, that in the case of Type I, the actual conceptualiser’s responsibility is higher, not openly shared with the original conceptualiser of the information frequently reported. In Type III, conceptualisers share the responsibility for the information that they frequently quote with the original speakers/writers.

The nature of the study and the limitation in the sample size renders these conclusions preliminary. However, they contribute to previous research and have opened up a research niche that should not be neglected. Future research on a larger scale is necessary to explore the implications of the current results further.
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Appendix

List of data sources of the examples in the article:

1. bang head – Traducción al español – Linguee
   www.linguee.es/inglesespanol/ traduccion/bang+head.html
2. CÓMO LLEGAR A LA HORA DE LA MUERTE
   latostadora.us/viewtopic.php?t=10304&start=20
3. 138 – Agroterra
   www.agroterra.com …) | Discusiones Generales | Maquinaria Agrícola
4. [Series] Spilovers of Arrow y The Flash: Identidades secretas…
   blogdesuperheroes.es | Series | Series DC | Arrow (2012 - ?)
5. Next subject – Gabitos
   www.gabitos.com/cristianos/template.php?hm=1369882810
depongyangalabana.blogspot.com/2014_10_01_archive.html
7. Bruce Lee como buscador espiritual ("Be water, my friend")
gabrieljaraba.typepad.com/gabriel_jaraba…/10/bruce_lee_como_.html
8. Rating récord para Letterman – Clarín
   www.clarin.com/…/Television-David_Letterman-despedida_0_1361264...
9. Muere tras rodar montaña abajo en una bola de plástico…
www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2013/01/08/internacional/1357657848.html
10. Historia y Cine: Game Change (2012), la historia de cómo…
    www.historiaycine.com/2012/09/Game-Change-Pelicula-2012.html
11. Sergio Rodríguez seguirá tres años más al frente del timón…
    enestando.es/sergio-rodriguez-renueva-con-el-real-madrid-hasta-el-2015/
12. Al final hago el ciclo del amigo málaga, pero tengo dudas…
    www.tupinche.net/…/al-final-hago-el-ciclo-del-amigo-malaga-pero-teng...
13. Spoiler sobre Amaia + IMAGENES (7 x 14) – El internado…
    www.formulatv.com | Series | El internado
14. Foro Fisiomorfosis Tema: lyle Mcdonald – Las weider son…
    fisiomorfosis.com/…/29889-lyle-mcdonald-las-weider-son-ineficaces?
15. En la UBA
    www. enlabka. blogspot.com/2004_12_01_enlabka_archive.html
16. Foros de opinión: ¿Cuál es el mejor personaje de Star Wars…
    www.comunidadumbria.com ) | Sin clasificar
17. Foro Tanoshii Fansub – QUALITY
    www.tanoshii-fansub.com/foro/archive/index.php?thread-5653-10...
18. ALCANTINAS – Página 12 – Foros de TELVA.com
    foros.telva.com ) | Belleza y Salud | Embarazo
19. Noticias de La Palma – Luis Muñera dice que Los Indians…
    www.elapuron.com | Municipios
20. Algunos refranes de abril-Blog de Maldonado – El Tiempo maldonado.eltiempo.es/algunos-refranes-de-abril/
21. Plus Anime [ manga ] [ La Anguila
    unanguila.com/ aquellaquienlee/plus-anime-manga/
22. notes – Uned
    www.edn.es/geohistoria/…/TABLILLA_CNOSSES_PERFUME.htm
23. Lacan, el bárbaro: desarrollo y estructura de la teoría…
    https://books.google.es/books?isbn=95078646602005
24. Laboratorio | Taylor Latinoamérica
    www.taylorla.com/productos/laboratorio
25. Escuela de Yoga en Zaragoza. Bibliografía de Textos…
    www.yogaenzaragoza.com/es/bibliografia/textos-tradicionales-ii/…/174
26. A Waglington Fan fiction - Fanfiction.net
    https://www.tanfiction.net/…/A-Wizard-s-Journey-A-… -
27. Premium tank crew’s – General Discussion – World of Tanks…
    forum.worldoftanks.eu ) | | General Discussion
28. This looks like it’s made for consoles - Steam Community
    steamcommunity.com/…/558748822310962669)?…
29. Princess Diana Told Friend Royal Fam are Reptilian - David Icke’s …
    forum.davidicke.com ) | Main Forums | Reptilians
30. 21678.1 – ABC.com
    mh.abc.go.com/discussions/General…(21678.17…
31. Q: Are We Not Men? A: We Are a Devo Documentary
    www.musicfilmweb.com/…/devo-music-documentary …
32. STAR WARS: The Old Republic
    www.swtor.com ) | English | General Discussion
33. so is the game finished?: Towns General Discussions
    steamcommunity.com/app/…/864977025767584692 …
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