

Direct evidentiality: discursive strategies in Romanian

Drd. Adelaida-Maria-Evelina ȚIPLIUĂ
Școala Doctorală „Alexandru Piru”,
Universitatea din Craiova

Résumé: Dans cet article, la situation de preuve directe de ses types d'opérateurs est analysée. La brève présentation du cadre théorique, mais aussi des conditions qu'un enregistrement doit remplir pour marquer la zone de preuve directe est illustrée sur la base d'un riche corpus, extrait de « Solenoid » de Mircea Cărtărescu. La recherche contient, en outre, l'analyse comparative des deux types de preuves: directe et indirecte, en définissant et en observant le comportement de ses types de marqueurs et leur délimitation, qui est fortement dépendante du contexte.

Mots clés: preuve directe, perception, inférence

Introduction

This study has as its general objective the presentation of syntactic and semantic peculiarities of the types of operators in the case of *direct evidentiality*. The general theoretical framework in the presentation of the operators' types through which *direct evidentiality* is manifested is defined by *evidentials* – *evidentials marks*, a framework concept, analyzed from various perspectives and located at the intersection of several areas of linguistics: semantics, pragmatism and syntax. At the same time, the first part of this report is the description of the preliminary theoretical framework and involves the definition of *direct evidentiality*, a synthesis of the operators' types identified in literature. The main objective of the present study is not to present exhaustively the concept of *direct evidentiality*, but to mention the main theoretical directions that define this framework concept. The purpose of the present study is also to expose conceptual and analytical aspects for the semantic evolution in the Romanian language of the operators through which *direct evidentiality* is achieved, manifesting itself as a grammatical category, from a diachronic perspective. In particular, we have looked at how these evidentiality indicators contribute to increasing the acceptability of the

speaking' advanced point of view, according to the theoretical framework provided by dialectical pragmatism.

The study aims to draw a sketch of the definition, systematization and description of the *direct evidentiality* category, being structured both from the point of view of the theoretical framework (the status of the evidentiality marks and the directions of syntactic and semantic analysis), and the applicative part of it, which implies the syntactic and semantic description of the operators.

Considering the evolution of the evidentiality operators - from *direct evidentiality*, in the Romanian language, we can see that it enjoys the greatest credibility, the source behind the transmission of a message, in this case, is rendered in concrete terms.

In the Romanian language, *direct evidentiality* is achieved only at the lexical level, not the grammatical one, and the contextual semantic oscillation drags the meanings of the operators from the expression of concrete, direct entities, to the limit of doubt, uncertainty, supposition, therefore, the role played by these means of marking the *evidentiality* is different. Although they are not part of the functional class of marks bearing the significance of *evidentiality*, they may, under certain conditions, express values close to those of the evidentiality.

I. DIRECT EVIDENTIALITY

1.1. Conceptual specifications

Direct evidentiality refers, in most situations, to visual evidence, but in fact it includes any type of sensory evidence, i.e. evidence obtained from the senses: sight, hearing, touch, smell or sensation that refers to the source of the information. Visual evidences are used for events that have been seen (personal witness) by the speaker, thus expressing a high degree of truth on what has been reported. So we can consider that this class of indicators of *direct evidentiality* includes:

- verbs of perception (*see, hear, feel, taste, smell*), in addition to these verbs that lexicalize the forms of sensory perception, there is another series of words (*seeming, apparently, obviously*) that acquire, in certain contexts, direct obvious values, by translating the perceptive knowledge of a fact;

- presentative (*here, this*), in addition to the presenters themselves, we can add expressions with presentative value: *Check it out!, Behold!, Look!*;

According to the broad conception of *evidentiality*, Gabriela Scripnic categorizes *direct evidentiality* according to obvious indicators:

- *Perception indicators*: their purpose is to demonstrate that the speaker has acquired information through visual and auditory experience. The most explained indicators belonging to this category are the verbs of perception. Information that is not personally observed by the speaker (as opposed to

information obtained from a visual, auditory or even olfactory experience) may be presented in speech as a result of interference or as reported knowledge.

Anca Gâță (2009:484-490), drawing on the distinction of *direct evidentiality* and *indirect evidentiality*, achieves a very refined taxonomy, which includes subclasses for *direct and indirect evidentiality*.

Direct evidentiality includes the following classification levels and subclasses:

First classification level: *performative evidentiality* (indicates that the speaker knows what he is talking about because he has performed or is in the process of performing a certain action) versus the *non-performative/sensory/experimental evidentiality*:

- (1) It is forbidden to enter Australia with food. **I know what I'm saying, because I had to give up my packages.** (performative evidentiality)
- (2) **Look!** He's walking! (non-performative evidentiality)

The second level of classification: *non-performative evidentiality* has two subclasses, namely *non-visual evidentiality and visual evidentiality* (the speaker knows what it is because it is/was a visual witness of the situation presented):

- (3) **I smell gas.** Didn't you turn off the oven? (non-visual evidentiality)
- (4) **I saw him** leave the house at dawn. (visual evidentiality)

The third level of classification: *non-visual evidentiality* also has two subclasses, *objective evidentiality* (involves a sense of touch and taste, which involve direct contact with an object and are therefore more objective than other senses) towards *non-objective/subjective evidentiality* (refers to the sense of smell and hearing that is considered less objective than touch and taste):

- (5) This fabric is very soft. **(I say this because I touched it)** (objective evidentiality)
- (6) **I heard him** close the door. (subjective evidentiality)

The fourth level of classification: *objective evidentiality* can be divided into two subclasses, *tactile evidentiality vs. taste evidentiality*, while *non-objective evidentiality* in turn includes *auditory evidentiality vs. non-auditory evidentiality*.

- (7) **Mmm,** looks ripe!

The fifth level of classification: *non-auditory evidentiality* is classified as *olfactory evidentiality vs. ultra-subjective evidentiality* (the information conveyed is obtained through a less reliable process);

(8) **It smells** like it's burned, is the food still in the oven?

The sixth classification level: *ultra-subjective evidentiality* in turn comprises two subclasses, *evidentiality* based on a symptom vs. *evidentiality* based on a sign; these two categories are not marked by the use of an evidential indicator, but are supported by internal sensations or external clues:

1. I have a **toothache!** (*evidentiality* based on a symptom)
(10) I have **an abscess** in my teeth! (*evidentiality* based on a sign)

Types of operators

Perception verbs vs. cognition verbs

The concept of *perception* corresponds to psychology, where theories concerning the nature of the processes specific to this area are developed, but in this chapter we will not dwell on these properties, as they are not the subject of linguistic research. By corroborating the definitions of this area, in psychology, perception is defined as follows: „the function responsible with the capture of information about events in the external or internal environment, by the path of sensory mechanisms.” In DEXI we note the extension of this term in the cognitive area, which is why we found it important to make a presentation of the verbs of cognition, in order to notice the closeness of meaning: „complex sensory and objectual psychic process, in which direct and unitary reflection of the attributes and structure of objects and phenomena is achieved, distinguishing itself from sensation by synthesis and complexity”. Existing linguistic studies make few references to perception per se, and most references are made on the basis of verbs that lexicalize the term *to perceive*. In a broad sense, DEXI defines the verb *to perceive*: „senses and thinking through direct reflection”. According to this definition, there is an opacity of the physical process, tending towards a semantic closeness to the cognitive area.

There are thus some general typological characteristics of perception verbs before examining how these verbs can be used as evidentiality and how they can assume various nuances of subjective meaning. Evidentiality marks of this type vary in their semantic extension, depending on the system and structure. In a narrow sense, the term *to perceive* works first-hand in recording and processing visual evidence and then other sensory evidence that can be extended to indicate the direct participation, control and volitivity of the speaker. Thus, according to the semantic area it covers, the verb *to perceive* functions as a hyperonym for the other verbs that designate the process of perception:

(11) „they had **perceived** only a great light without contours.” (*to see*)

(12) „I immediately **perceived** a pure silence as the white of the snow.” (*to hear*)

- (13) „You, who only have a bunch of antennas when you should actually be able to **perceive** everything.” / „All I could **perceive** was the awkward itching of the mohair wool on my naked neck.” (*to feel*)

Verbs involving the experience of the reported ones refer strictly to sensory perception, without any epistemic meaning whatsoever.

In the process denoted by the verbs of perception, Poutsma (apud Kryk 1978: 119) states that they represent „sensory reception of a independent stimulus of the will of the person involved in the perception process”, and subsequently, the terminology associated with perceptual processes was nuanced. Established terminological distinctions were used to setting several types of uses of perception verbs, based on semantic and syntactic traits that differentiate them.

In recent years, perception verbs have aroused the interest of foreign specialists [Grezka 1990, Franckel, Lebaud 1990] and Romanian specialists [Nicula 2010, 2011], trying to describe as complete as possible the syntactic behavior and semantics of these verbs. The categorizations in Romanian linguistics concerned the subgroup of *perception verbs*, classified according to the receiving organs of physical stimuli in a) *verbs of visual perception: to see, to look, to show*, b) *verbs of auditory perception: to listen and to hear*, c) *verbs of tactile perception: to feel and touch*, d) *verbs of taste perception: to taste, tastes like* and, e) *verbs of olfactory perception: to smell* [Nicula 2010: 44–47], according to perception classes with three groups: *non-intentional/non-agentive perception verbs, intentional/agentive perception verbs and evidentiality verbs* [Nicula 2010: 44–47]. The verbs of perception were thus separated from those of cognition, although the conclusions of these studies [Nicula 2010, 2011] revealed numerous overlaps or semantic extensions between the two classes.

Within the second category, cognition verbs tend towards the adoption of the name of *cognitive verbs* or *cognitive attitude verbs* (engl. *cognitive verbs, verbs of cognitive attitude*, fr. *verbescognitifs*), by renouncing sub-categorization into mental and/or sensory operations, now considered unitary. For example, for English being inventoried 25 such verbs by Gloria Cappelli [2008: 531]: *assume* / „a presupune”, *believe* / „a crede”, *bet* / „a paria”, *conjecture* / „a presupune”, *consider* / „a considera”, *doubt* / „a suspecta”, „a se îndoii”, *expect* / „a nădăjdui”, *fancy* / „a socoti”, „a presupune”, *feel* / „a simți”, *figure* / `a-și închipui”, *gather* / „a bănuî”, *guess* / „a-și închipui”, „a fi de părere”, *imagine* / „a-și imagina”, *judge* / „a aprecia”, „a considera”, *know* / „a ști”, *presume* / „a-și închipui”, „a bănuî”, *reckon* / „a crede”, „a presupune”, *see* / `a vedea”, *sense* / „a înțelege”, „a pricepe”, *suppose* / „a presupune”, „a-și închipui”, *surmise* / „a bănuî”, „a suspecta”, *suspect* / „a bănuî”, „a suspecta”, *think* / „a gândi”, „a înțelege”, *trust* / „a spera”, „a nădăjdui”, *wonder* / „a se întreba”. Therefore, in English, this category of verbs forms a complex,

dynamic system and as can be seen by the translation into the Romanian language, it is characterized by two peculiarities: *epistemically* and *evidentially* [Gloria Cappelli 2008: 531], being arranged on the cognitive axis between two poles: *knowing* and *not knowing*, encoding different types of data from perception, knowledge (inference) or affectivity (impressions, beliefs) [Gloria Cappelli 2008: 531]. On this axis there are no fixed, punctual positions, but only values that vary according to the semantic or pragmatic context [Gloria Cappelli 2008: 531]. In other words, in certain contexts, the above verbs have the ability to give the speaker the opportunity to epistemically assess a state of affairs [Cappelli 2007:178].

From the point of view of the perspectives of analysis, the problem of perception verbs is closely related to that of discursive markers, in pragmatism, and to the problem of incident and comment structures, in syntax. Traditional grammars systematically avoided the subject of verbal discursive markers because they could not receive „canonical” grammatical descriptions, rather having the effect of „damaging” the syntax and being present exclusively in oral communication, so „nonstandard”. In general, verbal markers have been denied grammatical status because they are not mandatory [Waltereit 2002], they are very much related to the interpersonal dimension [Manili 1989], but also regional or content variation of the statement [Benjamin 2010: 254].

In recent Romanian language works, these aspects can be found – piecemeal – in chapters dedicated to the Frastic and trans-fracic connectors, with particular reference to the expressions: *as you have seen, as you can see, as seen* [GALR: 735].

It has been observed that the incidental sequences of glossary of mental, verbal, sensory actions, in a narrative, are introduced by verbs such as *declarandi, cogitandi, sentiendi: to say, to talk, to shout, to start, to repeat, to hear, to think*[Gabrea, 1965] and that the call to the receiver is made by tics – false vocations/imperatives/interrogative – coming from the automation of some initial nicknames sequences: *you understand me, you imagine, you know, hear, brother, sir, right to tell you, see well, etc.*, with a phatic role [Pop 1991: 81].

A larger system of expression of sources on the reception of external information concerns the category of perception verbs, therefore, communication verbs, cognition verbs or various adjectives that refer to chromatics or properties aimed at taste, smell can be included in the category of direct evidentiality. Between the verbs of perception appear a series of „swipes” or overlaps of meaning, especially in the case of *to see* (etymologically motivated by the Indo-European root **weid-*, which designates, in a general manner, *knowledge* and *vision* as a particular case of knowledge): *to hear* for „to find out” or „to be rumored” and *to see for* „to find, to observe”. The Romanian language frequently allows such „swipes”, also signalled by other authors (e.g. *to see* with the meaning of *to hear* or *to perceive* with *to taste*), explained by the

interdependence between different sense organs, which work „together and bound” [Cazacu 1950: 259]:

„Let's *see* what N says”

„*See* what he's talking about and then give your opinion about him.”

„I'm *looking for* the gravy to see, it is salty?” [Cazacu 1950: 259]

Perception enjoys the greatest source of credibility, as it denotes the direct participation of the speaker in the process expressed by the prediction in his statement.

Perception covers information acquired through seeing, hearing, sense, taste – generally known directly and observable. The mode of manifestation of perception is found only at the lexical level. The verb *to see* has an informational function, but, in addition to other verbs that designate direct perceptions, it is complex, marking, first of all, the transmission of information on object attributes, its meaning being strongly dependent on context. The syntactic variety in which perception verbs are involved correlates with the diversity of stimuli that can be perceived. In the case of visual perception, visual stimuli cover: concrete entities, but on the other hand, punctuate events, processes and lasting states. Depending on the context, as we said above, but also on the distance from the observed object, the verbs of perception can express both *direct perception* and *indirect perception*.

In systems with three or more terms that can designate sensory processes, as in the case of the Romanian language, perceptual evidentials cover information acquired through observation, and can be extended to indicate and assume the certainty of the information in the assertion, as *infrasub* (11):

(14) „*Sees* all the bread eaters, and the ones with the dog's head.”
(Budai-Deleanu, Ion, *Țiganiada*)

Based on the syntactic configuration, the physical direct perception of an ongoing process is expressed, and a visual record is used, the speaker recounts through the prism of his own senses that the information set in the statement presents a high degree of truth. In this context, the verb is used with its own meaning, that of *observing*, of *noticing* those who eat bread and especially those who have the head like the dog, creating a visual image of their own.

From the point of view of reflection, here we can talk of a multimodal reflection - reporting to several analyzers that allow the identification of complex attributes, such as: movement, the shape of people, their size.

(15) „Do you know how I *see* the difference between the politician and the economic man?” (Petrescu, *Jurnal cu Petre Țuțea*)

(16) "I see you've been tidying up... are you waiting for someone?"
(Cimpoesu, *Simionliftnicul*)

Thus, comparing with (15) in (16) the indirect value of perception is rendered by the meaning of *imagining*, the verb denoting cognitive representations, assimilated to the predictions of *understanding*, of *intuition*.

On the other hand, in (16), the verb acquires inferential value, by the meaning it expresses in the context of the assertion, that of *believing*, *suspecting*, *inferring* the fact that a guest would have expected, thus the statement acquires a dubious character, so an *indirect physical perception* is expressed, because what is perceived are certain indications that lead to the observation that someone is coming to visit.

All the examples given offer various semantic interpretations, so, according to Haan's theory, the speaker must keep in mind a clear distinction between direct access to a source of information (14) and indirectly (15), (16). Difference in interpretation between contexts (14) and (16) is explained by the semantico-syntactic structure of the subordinate sentence: in (16) the perception of an event in which the speaker did not take part (the verb in the subordinate is [+Perfectiv]), compared to the verb in the matrix, [+Present]].

14), the speaker recounts, through his own senses, visually, through the mark of *direct evidentiality* – he *sees* – what has happened, so the information asserted enjoys great credibility, referring to the fundamental stage of acquiring information, so in this case, *direct perception* (through the senses) is excluded as an epistemic way. Statements (15) and (16) have two types that differ in relation to volitivity. Activity-type verbs, the statement (15) and (16), refer to volitive perception, while verbs in the statement (14) appeal to experience.

In the Romanian language, the verb *to see* introduces configurations with three prototyping complements: *that*, *if*, and the selection of the complement is routed semantico-syntactic as follows: it depends on the speaker's commitment to the certainty of the subordinate clause and, at the same time, is associated with the selection of the provision: *to* for the subjunctive, *that* for the indicative, *if* for probabilities.

The configuration with the verb *to see* followed by *that* expresses: *direct perception*, as it is in example (17), first position; *indirect perception* in the second position, thus, here, the verb functions as a verb of cognition, transiting to the epistemic zone.

(17) „I see that there is a lot of investment, but I also see that there are certain imbalances.”

To see + to – this pattern appears in imperative contexts, in which the verb makes agentive sense *take care*. The effect of using the subjunctive after the verb of perception is to alleviate the meaning of *the mandatory* act of speech directive.

(18) „You will see that you cannot bring all your burns in all the places you will see;” (Deuteronomul, Cap. 12)

In (19), the verb *to see* has the value of an indirect interrogation and expresses a cognitive perception (transmits the meanings of *finding, verifying, thinking*), having a meta-discursive function, expressing the doubting, distrust of the speaker towards the content.

As a result of the demonstration, perception verbs of this type focus on the phenomenon, and this property makes verbs of this type suitable for an evidentiality use.

(19) „See if you need a statement and how you can reach the destination without problems.”

Any entity [+concrete] or [+abstract] may appear in the direct object position of the verb *to see*. If the verb expresses a sense of the perceptive domain, the direct object will have the character of a real image, given that the perceived entity is placed in the field of vision of the experimenting subject. If the verb expresses meaning in the imaginary, cognitive domain, the direct object will display the virtual image of the feature, because the experienced subject obtains a mental picture of what it perceives.

We have integrated the verb of perception, such as to see, because we believe that it is an integral part of the category of *evidentiality*, thus being able to explain the frequent semantic „swipes” from the physical perceptions themselves towards epistemic meanings. Referring to the fundamental stage of *information acquisition*, the position that *direct perception* (through the senses) is excluded as an *epistemic way* should be accepted.

The verb *to seem*

In her article on the *evidentiality*, „Evidentiality in the current Romanian language”, Rodica Zafiu distinguishes an evidential attitude within the verb *to seem* and the frastic adverb that comes from it, *it seems*. It should be noted that, depending on the context, it supports semantic swipes in relation to the two types of evidentiality: „it seemed that night to occupy a quarter of the sky. (perception)/ „It seems to me that we kind of look very much alike.” (*Solenoid*, Mircea Cărtărescu) - inference.

The verb *to seem* is one of the most complex verbs in the Romanian language, both syntactically and semantically, so, by analyzing the types of occurrences in which it develops various semantic values, it can be said that it is a polyfunctional verb.

Semantically framed in the class of verbs that express the idea of appearance in perception: the traits [+cognitive],[+perception/appearance] define the degree of certainty that the speaker has in relation to the reality of

the state described in the statement – *to seem* thus represents an operator of *direct evidentiality*.

(20) „He **seemed** blackened by the weather, moldy and snowed and smoldered by the passage of time.” (Cărtărescu Mircea, *Solenoid*)

(21) „Instead, the nooseless dwarf **seemed** to have an unusual success: always full of people in the hall, full as the church on the night of the Resurrection.” (Cărtărescu Mircea, *Solenoid*)

At the same time, Zafiu states that „indicates a knowledge inferred from direct perception, from appearances, or inference by analogy, as well as the value of an epistemic judgment itself, with values on a very large scale, from unreal to probable” (Zafiu 2008: 711), thus the verb *to seem* cannot be disputed its evidential value, in turn expresses „uncertainty of a direct impression” (GALR, II: 682). In the source sphere of the information of the sentence content, in this verb’s case, three values specific to evidentiality are derived: *perception*, *inference* and *account*. There is, on the one hand, information concerning the perceptual sphere – based on visual, auditory, sensory processes – in general, and, on the other hand, information obtained indirectly (which is in turn divided into: information taken – in the „second or third hand” or from folklore – but also inferential statements – on the basis of reasoning, inferences, evidence). As far as direct information is concerned, it is expressed by marking direct perceptions (which can be visual, auditory). In this situation, the assertions are constructed with *to seem* non-reflective and with the lifting of the subject:

(22) When it snows, the city **seems** clear and beautiful. – is expressed a general evidential perceptive (general, which can be shared by others) through the tension of two plans (*the city* essentially and *the snowy city*, in appearance).

As the operator of *direct evidentiality*, in (22), the perceptual value of the verb *to seem* is associated with the presence, in the alternative, of perceptual visual, auditory images, thus it is the context that gives a complete picture of the semantic sides of this evidentiality. The same verb, accompanied by the reflexive pronoun in dative, *it seemed* to him to mark the assumption of information about the described event, the speaker – whose identity is marked by the pronominal form, expresses the uncertainty of a direct impression.

The probable value of information not assumed by the speaker is expressed in the case of impersonal, reflexive forms of this verb. In this case, the absence of any reliable information in relation to the event described in the statement shall be expressed. The talking subject only assumes the existence of such a situation but has no real clues about it. The information related to this type of situation is mostly subjective, and the verb *to seem* to polarize around the indirect evidentiality type.

The adverb *almost*

Almost is like a recent agglutinate in the language (< *seems + that*) that functions as an evidential adverb, indicating the perceptual source of information, namely the uncertainty of perception or memory. (GALR 2008 I: 600) In the current language, the evidential adverb *almost* is used in different syntactic contexts: integrated with the statement it nuances with minimal differences in focus:

(23) **It's like** yesterday the press was dirty.

(24) Yesterday **it was like** the mat was dirty.,

parathetic, isolated:

(25) Yesterday, **it's like**, the mat was dirty., but, regardless of syntactic achievement, it functions as a mark of *direct evidentiality*, highlighting the uncertainty of information taken over perceptually – by seeing.

Like the verb *to seem*, the adverb *almost*, in order to designate perceptual qualities regarding the source of information, must be associated within the sentence content with concrete entities, from the sphere of auditory or visual perception, thus elucidating their own semantic values. Most joints exploit and convey the lexical function of the adverb – the apparent qualification of events, aspects, facts, images, as being obtained through perceptual processes.

In linguistic works, the values contained within each sense developed between the two operators – *to seem* and *almost* to be rendered with the help of a scale that constitutes the semantic area of that field, and their value is grouped according to meaning – cert-uncertain.

The two operators function as linguistic means of achieving the value of uncertainty – which implies insufficient knowledge by the speaker of the situation described in the statement. As regards the delimitation of the two obvious values – certainty/uncertainty, it should be noted that they cannot be clearly distinguished in all situations. And, in fact, the existence of a gradation in their organisation must be allowed, at one pole being the value of *cert* and at the other pole – *uncertain*, between them being a transitional zone. The semantic area of these two values is described between the two limits.

Other lexemes, in the category of adverbs, acquire, in contexts, values of the expression of direct evidentiality, by the fact that they refer to the perceptive knowledge of a fact:

(26) „Only one is dissected, with **obvious** pleasure, by Borcescu on a large plateau laid on the chair.” (*Solenoid*, Mircea Cărtărescu)

(27) „It is **obvious** that I am told something, insistently, constantly, like a continuous pressure on the head.” (*Solenoid*, Mircea Cărtărescu)

(28) „For as long as I can remember, all I can do is look for gaps in the seemingly smooth, logical, the crack-free surface of the models under the head.” (*Solenoid*, Mircea Cărtărescu)

Deictics with a presentative role

Deictics are textual marks, indicators with a pragmatic encoding function, the semantic area of which they bear is strongly dependent on the context and show various coordinates, be they personal ((41), (42)), spatial ((30), (32), (33), (35), (35)), temporal ((29), (30), (43)) linguistic ((31), (34), (40)). At present, among the Romanian linguists who approached this area, of the deictics, we remember names like: L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, D. Roventă-Frumușani, A. Costăchescu, Al. Alexandrescu, R. Zafiu, A. Hobjilă, Cl. Pisoschi, Fl. Dimitrescu. In GARL, it is claimed that the deictice covers all the modes of expression which ensure that the message is anchored in the communication situation in which it is produced, (62, II:635), which leads us to support the fact that the information contained in the statement refers directly to its source, in other words, the deictics/ relational elements/ textual connectors/ signposts/ language marks refer to a reviewer, without calling it. Therefore, the deictics are some indicative codes, which refer to various communicative circumstances, and the deciphering of the message will depend on certain contextual spatial-temporal parameters, which will guide the correct interpretation of the source of the message. For example, in (33), the deictical **here** represents spatial, with reference to the communicative act, so through it is referred to the clear place from which the information is reported, strongly correlated in the expression of direct evidentiality. The bridge between the verbal and contextual plan representing knowledge of the world, implicit cognitive baggage, necessary in the process of complete and correct interpretation of the statement is observed. It is also worth mentioning that there is no material meaning here (any of the circumstances can be substituted: *in the house, in the forest, in China*), so the receiver must be careful to decode the message, since the same discursive can acquire different connotations.

- (29) „I still have **now**, by my mother's care, in a tick-tock box, all my milk teeth, and through her care I have my pigtails from the age of three.”
- (30) „I remember, like **today**, when I was on my way back on the tram, in the depths of a summer evening with the rose clouds, from **there**, from the bottom of Colentina, where I had first been to see my school.”
- (31) „And **look**, there's never been a miracle, and there's every chance that it's going to be.”
- (32) „**There**, in the wilderness of Monday morning of Obor Square, walking by hand with my mother, I saw the poster stuck to a pole.”
- (33) „The smell of rancid fat was coming **from here** all over the neighborhood.”
- (34) „I never knew exactly how to spell it, but **here** I am.”
- (35) „Like a pastiche after... **here** were strung about twenty names.”
- (36) „**Now** I write, and even write the text that, reading sophisticated and powerful and clever and sophisticated books and full of madness and wisdom.”
- (37) „And **today** I mess up catalogs and hit foreign classes.”

- (38) „**That's** where you smooth out your clothes, wipe the despair off your face, and come in affable, put on jokes and bavardage, as if nothing had happened.”
- (39) „Each **now** held Professor Naumov's cure with holiness.”
- (40) „And **here** he is, indeed, the short, obese body on which the head, perfectly spherical, disproportionately large, seems the final lump in the make-up of a snow hymn.”
- (41) „When you enter **this** tract, **this** channel from another world and another life, the climate changes and the seasons turn upside down.”
- (42) „**This** demented, desperate glow, **this** call for help then made me, **that** October evening, want my ugly, sad home more than anything in the world.”
- (43) „**Now**, when he was maybe living his last few years, he had thought of selling it, even though he didn't think he could.”
- (44) „It's just that it's caught right **here**, with screws, to the ceiling.”

Personal deictics anchor, indicate the participants or persons involved, directly or indirectly, performing pragmatic functions, evoking precisely and are intended to report the content of the statement to the discursive framework.

Textual presenting interjection **here** is a way into „semi-informal”, oral communication, taking over the tasks of „look” as presenter (as a mark of perceptual knowledge). The interjection **here** develops, depending on the context, various values: demonstration value – aims to draw the attention of the author to the actual and singularizing presence of an object in the referential world, directing his gaze on the latter: (40), argumentative value – presentative of existence and identity, acquires the value of paraphrasing those presented (36). Moreover, its function supports other valences: deictic (inserts persona, objects in situational context: *Here's* who comes!) or discursive (introduces a statement whose content is emphasized: But *here* is heard throughout the room a sound.)

The interjection *really*

Interjection *really* is specific to the Romanian, popular oral language, an invariably autonomous word that expresses a sensory impression and is used where the speaker uses it to give credibility to his words. In grammaticalized not-at-all structures, ill-facing acts are „quire présentent une modalité veridictoire exprimée avec la force de l'évidence.” (Țutescu 2006: 49) The evidential *really* refers to the Latin *etimondeus*, so the uses in the current language are due to etymological diachrony. The speaker appeals to the supreme court to reinforce the claim.

Not generalized, it works to announce two semantic valences: denial and affirmation, and grammatical behavior due to frequent use gives it a triple status: indicator, iconic and symbolic. At the same time, by excellence, the interjection can be called „a way of speaking/communicating”, which

corresponds to a „pragmatic way”, specific to a style of communication, but with a latent power of suggestion.

(45) „-It's working, **look**, it's not a shag,
To the death, the whole world.”
(DoniciAlecu, *Bondarulmizantrop*)

In (45), the interjection **really** refers to the speaker taking God as a witness to certify the truth of his words. The semantic values that the evidential develops refer to the perceptual sphere, i.e. that the asserted information is taken visually.

Conclusions

In this study we aimed to delineate the lexico-semantic class of the operators' types through which *direct evidentiality* is manifested. At the same time, we sought to present comparatively the approaches and differences of meaning between the lexical units that make up the field of perception verbs, but also of other lexemes that operate in expressing certainty on the source of the message.

We started from fixing the theoretical framework of each evidential, corroborating, by example, the two evidential attitudes that it develops according to context: both *direct and indirect evidentiality*

We continue by following how polysemia manifests at the verb's level to see (considered a representative member of the class of perception verbs and the most extensive semantic), to which a variable number of meanings is assigned from the perspective of the two types of *evidentiality*. We analyzed this verb, starting from the initial observation, that it has building properties in the sphere of expressing a direct but also indirect, social attitude towards cognition - inference.

The class of adverbs, of interjections that lead through the semantics it carries towards the perceptual zone is surprised and analyzed by means of a rich corpus, stopping at phenomena related to the expression of *direct evidentiality*, observing the heterogeneity of the units included in the delimited class.

Bibliography

- Gâță, Anca, (2009), *A taxonomy of evidential functions* In G. Colipca & I. GALR: Gramatica limbii române, București, Editura Academiei, 2005.
- Waltereit R., (2002), *Imperatives, interruption in conversation, and the rise of discourse markers: A study in Italian guarda*, în „Linguistics”, 40–45, p. 987–1010, <http://www.staff.ncl.ac.uk/richard.waltereit/guarda.pdf>.
- Gabrea M., (1965), *Construcții incidente aspect morfologico-sintactice și stilistice*, în LR, 14, 5, p. 533–544.
- Pop, *Incidența incidentelor*, în „Studii și cercetări lingvistice”, 42,3–4, p.73–87.
- Cazacu B, (1950), *Despre înțelesul unor verbe „sentiendi”*, în “Studii și cercetări lingvistice”, 1, p. 257–264.
- Greška A., (1990), *La polysémie des verbes de perception visuelle*, Paris, L’Harmattan.
- Nicula I., (2010), *Lexicul verbelor de percepție. Delimitări și clasificări*, în „Studies in Linguistics and Communication”, București, Editura Paralela 45.
- Nicula I., (2011), *Utilizări ale verbului A VEDEA în româna vorbită*, în ROVA: 224–233.
- Cappelli G., (2008), *Antonymy and verbs of cognitive attitude: when know is the opposite of think and believe*, în M. Bertuccelli Papi, A. Bertacca și S. Bruti (eds): *Threads in the Complex Fabric of Language*, Pisa, Pisa University Press, p. 529–546, <http://www.gloriacappelli.it/wp-content/uploads/HYPERLINK> <http://www.gloriacappelli.it/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/7-cappelli12sm.pdf>
- Scripnic, Gabriela, (2012), *Communication, Argumentation et Mediativite, Aspects de l'évidentialité en français et en roumain*, 23.
- Țutescu, Mariana, (2006), *L'interjection- modalisation, axiologisation et grammaticalisation. Le cas des interjection roumaines zău et vai*, Langages, 161: 37-46.

