CECILIA MIHAELA POPESCU
University of Craiova
cecilia.popescu@edu.ucv.ro
ORCID: 0000-0003-1340-8032

INDIRECT EVIDENTIALITY AND THE EXPRESSION OF THE SPEAKER'S STANCE IN ROMANIAN

Abstract

The study aims to emphasize how lexical particles and grammatical constructions express indirect evidentiality and the speaker's stance in Romanian. As with the other Romance languages, Romanian contains the grammatical means to express the speaker's knowledge source, such as the Conditional Mood, a prototypical quotative/reportative evidential marking, or the Subjunctive and the Future, which, together with the Presumptive, a modal form specific to this linguistic system alone, function as markers of indirect evidentiality of the inferential type. Additionally, each of these forms can be augmented by a rich lexicalized system of adverbs and particles. For example, *pesemne* ['probably', literally *on + signs*], *poate* ['may be'; a regressive form from the third person singular of the verb *a se putea* < Late Latin *POTERE (Classical Latin POSSE)], *probabil* ['probably', < a borrowing from the Fr. *probable* and the Lat. PROBABILIS] are lexical particles of inferential evidentiality, and *cică* ['supposedly'; a lexicalized form from the expression [*se zi*]*ce că* – literally *it said that*], *pasămite* ['apparently' whose etymology is controversial] and *chipurile* ['supposedly'; a borrowing from Hungarian, literally 'faces'] are means of *quotative*/*reportative* evidentiality. This lexical and grammatical system marking indirect evidentiality will be analyzed with respect to their grammaticalization processes, but also addressing the discursive behaviour.

1. Introduction

The study aims to highlight how grammatical constructions and lexical particles express both indirect evidentiality and the speaker's stance in Romanian. Therefore, leaving aside the syntactic and lexical structures that inherently indicate the external source of information (such as the extended category of *verba declarandi*/*dicendi* or verbs explaining various mental processes as well as expressions with the same meaning), this study aims to describe the functional and semantic-pragmatic behaviour of the specialized markers in contemporary Romanian in order to demonstrate that the information expressed by the speaker is obtained indirectly, through inference or by citing another source. The main purpose of this approach is to underline that the Romanian language uses a wide and complex array of evidential strategies and markers, more or less grammaticalized and/or lexicalized. Therefore, we shall attempt to analyze the "pragmatic role differences" (Zafiu 2002: 130) between the markers which seem to have quasi-equivalent epistemic-evidential meanings and, thus, distinguish certain paradigmatic and/or typological particularities within this semantic-cognitive category.

   From a structural point of view, this corpus-based study is built (besides the Introduction and Final conclusions) around a comprehensive central section, which describes the ways in which indirect evidentiality is expressed in contemporary Romanian, specifically in two sub-sections: 2.1. Romanian grammatical means of expressing indirect evidentiality, and 2.2. Romanian lexical means of expressing indirect evidentiality.

2. The expression of indirect evidentiality in Romanian

As with the other Romance languages, Romanian contains the grammatical means to express the speaker's knowledge source, such as the Conditional Mood (hereinafter: COND), a prototypical quotative/reportative evidential marking, or the Subjunctive (hereinafter: SUB) and the Future (hereinafter: FUT), which, together with the Presumptive, a modal form specific to this linguistic system alone, function as markers of indirect evidentiality of the inferential type. Additionally, each of these forms can be augmented by a rich lexicalized system of adverbs and particles. For example, *pesemne* ['probably', literally *on + signs*], *poate* ['may be'; a regressive form from the third person singular of the verb *a se putea* < Late Latin *POTERE (Classical Latin POSSE)], *probabil* ['probably', < a borrowing from the Fr. *probable* and the Lat. PROBABILIS] are lexical particles of inferential evidentiality, and *cică* ['supposedly'; a lexicalized form from the expression [*se zi*]*ce că* – literally *it is said*, *one says that*], *pasămite* ['apparently', a form created through combining *-mite* (an element of Bulgarian origin) with the lexical sequence *pasă*, whose etymology is controversial – see Zafiu (2020c: 456), for more details]] and *chipurile* ['supposedly'; (apparently) the plural definite form of the noun *chip*, a borrowing from Hungarian, literally 'faces'] are means of *quotative*/*reportative* evidentiality. This grammatical and lexical system marking indirect evidentiality will be analyzed below, with respect to the grammaticalization processes, but also addressing the discursive behaviour.

2.1. Romanian grammatical means of marking indirect evidentiality

2.1.1. Grammatical means of marking inferential evidentiality

2.1.1.1.   One of the most important means of expressing inferential evidentiality is the Presumptive,[1] a set of modal forms based on the FUT. Having an inferential value, the Presumptive appears in a specific conversational matrix, such as (1) below:

(1) *Petru nu e acasă. **O veni** mai târziu.*
'Petru is not at home. **He may come** later.'[2]

As demonstrated in various situations (see Popescu 2013b: 50, 2015: 60), the properties of such occurrences are based on three factors:

a) the strongly subjective attitude of the speaker regarding the asserted content. S/he expresses his/her lack of trust (in the epistemic meaning) regarding the truth of his/her utterance, showing that s/he does not have all the information/knowledge to allow him/her to assert it with complete certainty;
b) the described situation is not the future, but the present or, at most, a present close to the future (see example (1) above);
c) the degree of *certainty* awarded by the speaker to the predication is of *strong probability*, with the meaning of such structures being close to utterances explicitly modified by modal operators, such as (Rom.) *probabil că* 'probably', used with the present indicative. The degree of knowledge expressed by the speaker is obtained through *inference.*

This inferential process starts from a finding, a real, objective fact, which is always confronted with the speaker's universe of knowledge. This is why, in Romanian, Presumptive forms are incompatible with sentences where the source of information does not refer to the speaker, but to a different person (cf. 2a, b vs. 3a, b):

(2) a. **Potrivit ANM, la munte **o ploua** PRESUMPTIVE 3rd sg.*
Literal translation: 'According to ANM, **it might rain** in the mountains.'
b. **Ion spune că **o ploua** PRESUMPTIVE 3rd sg.*
Literal translation: 'Ion says **it might rain**'

---

[1]   In Romanian, the *Presumptive mood* has three forms (two reference the present and one references the past):

a) a special structural type of its four FUT forms, *oi cânta* (i.e. the apheresized form of the auxiliary *a vrea* < Late Latin *VOLERE (Classical Latin VELLE), in the future tense and the short infinitive of the lexical verb) 'I may sing' (acronym: **Foi**) with reference to the present, and
b) a periphrastic structure including the future tense of the auxiliary *a fi* 'to be FUT' and the gerund of the lexical verb to express the present tense, or the past participle to express the past tense:
   – *(v)oi fi cântând* 'I may be singing' (acronym: **FoiG**) – to reference the present;
   – *(v)oi fi cântat* 'I may have sung' (acronym: **FoiP**) – to reference the past (see also Popescu and Duță 2017: 33).

[2]   All translations are ours.

(3)   a.   *Potrivit ANM, la munte **va ploua**$_{\text{FUT3rd sg}}$.*
          'According to ANM, **it will rain** in the mountains.'
      b.   *Ion spune că **va ploua** / **o să plouă** / **are să plouă**$_{\text{FUT3rd sg (canonical form or popular forms)}}$.*
          'Ion says **it will rain** / **it's going to rain**.'

Our opinion (see also Popescu 2015) is that, in such epistemic contexts, the Presumptive only expresses the prototypical feature [+prospective placement] or, more specifically, [+placement in *posteriority* ("ultériorité" – see Bres (2012))], since this verbal morpheme only marks the *posteriority of the hypothesis when compared to the previously assessed situation*. It is the content of the hypothesis that is chronologically represented in T_0, rather than the relation of *posteriority*. In other words, the verbal form only expresses the *relation of posteriority/ulteriority* that exclusively describes the cognitive process, while the content of the hypothesis is placed in the present(-future) frame of the speaker. This type of hypothesis is linguistically performed through a (declarative or interrogative) speech act and "speech acts are, by definition, performed by the speaker as s/he utters them"[3] (Vet and Kampers-Manhe 2001: 96, our translation).

2.1.1.2.   The Subjunctive Mood only expresses inference in dubitative-interrogative structures (also marked by the frequent use of the dubitative-interrogative particles *oare* or *cumva* 'somehow', 'possibly'), such as those in (4), (5) (6) and (7):

(4)   *Cine **să fie** la ora asta?* 'Who **could it be** at this time?'
(5)   ***Să fie** oare acasă?* (Zafiu 2002: 134) '**Could s/he be** at home?'
(6)   *Mihai, oare **să fi existând** strigoi?* (Squartini 2005: 259) 'Mihai, **could there be** ghosts?'
(7)   ***Să fi plecat** cumva?* '**Could he have gone** already?'

As seen in example (6), in such occurrences, the Romanian language also uses the gerundial periphrastic structure (*să fi existând* = an auxiliary in the subjunctive mood + the gerund of the lexical verb), which may "support the idea that evidentiality is partially grammaticalized in Romanian" (Zafiu 2002: 134).

2.1.2.   Grammatical means of marking *Quotative/Reportative Evidentiality*

2.1.2.1.   One of the fundamental values of the Romanian **COND** (present and perfect) is to indicate both quotation and storytelling as sources of information asserted in a sentence *p*. With this value, conditional forms appear in specific discursive patterns, frequently found in contemporary media language (as in (8) below).

(8)   *Un ofiţer MapN ne-a declarat că **ar fi vorba** despre muncitori civili aduşi să construiască bărăci.* (GALR 2008, I: 367)
      'A MApN officer told us that **they might be** civilian workers brought in to build barracks.'

---

3   "Les actes de langage sont par définition exécutés par le locuteur au moment de l'énonciation" (Vet and Kampers-Manhe 2001: 96).

The following features of this type of COND can be found in the literature (see Abouda 2001: 279; Gosselin 2001: 46):

a) the "journalistic" COND appears in informative assertive discourse;
b) the asserted information is taken from a source other than the speaker;
c) the speaker does not consider the asserted information;
d) the truth value of the asserted propositional content remains in the area of *uncertainty*;
e) the *uncertain, unclear* nature of the information is provisional and a confirmation is expected regarding the veracity of the asserted information.

In our opinion, these sentences imply a *secondary storytelling* (actually, the reproduction of another speech act), *placed in the area of supposition*. In other words, in quotative contexts such as ***Ar fi vorba*** despre muncitori civili aduși să construiască bărăci 'They might be civilian workers brought in to build barracks', p_{COND} has the meta-representative function of a sequence of the type "The MApN officer says: *Civilian workers are (being) brought in to build barracks*". In other words, an inference is made in T_0 based on a secondary enunciative benchmark that is more or less explicit and is not considered by the speaker-utterer. It can be formalized as follows: Secondary Enunciative Benchmark $\rightarrow$ [*posteriority$_{inferred}$*] p_{COND}.

In conclusion, in "evidential-quotative" uses, the COND can be considered a "mediative" form, if the inferential process covered, based on a secondary speech act, is considered. This can also be the reason why in Romanian, for instance, in quotative occurrences, the COND may be substituted by its Presumptive variant (CondG), which, however, cannot replace it in hypothetical or attenuative structures (see the restatement of example (8) in (9) below; cf. (10a, b) with (11a, b)):

(9) Un ofițer MapN ne-a declarat *că **ar fi vorba** / **ar fi fiind vorba** (= CondG) despre muncitori civili aduși să construiască bărăci*.
'A MApN officer told us that **they might be** / **they might be + BE**$_{GERUND}$ civilian workers brought in to build barracks.'

(10) a. *Dacă **ar vrea**, **ar putea***. 'If **he wanted to**, **he could**.'
b. ***Aș vrea** să vă întreb ceva*. '**I'd like** to ask you something.'

(11) a. **Dacă **ar fi vrând**, **ar fi putând***. 'If **he were + WANT**$_{GERUND}$, **he would + CAN**$_{GERUND}$.'
b. ****Aș fi vrând** să vă întreb ceva*. '**I'd be + LIKE**$_{GERUND}$ to ask you something.'

However, in the absence of any discursive or metadiscursive segment, it can be difficult to consider that this type of use of the COND is purely evidential and to make the "subtle" distinction in nuance between the distanced quotation of certain processes and the presentation of certain situations as the outcome of a supposition (cf. 12a and b):

(12) a. *Se spunea cum că **ar fi fost bolnavă***. (Sadoveanu, *Creanga de aur*, apud GALR 2005, I: 368) [distanced quotation].
'People said that **she might have been sick**.'

    b. *Alții* chibzuiau *că i-**ar fi poruncit** Împăratul să stea în ghinekeu, ca să nu s- ara-te dintr-odată două Împărătese.* (Sadoveanu, *Creanga de aur*, apud GALR 2005, I: 368) [supposition]
    'Other people thought that the Emperor **might have ordered** her to remain in her rooms, so that two Empresses would not appear at the same time.'

Such evidential sequences are not only found in media language, but also in scientific and literary discourse or even in a spoken, colloquial register. Moreover, this kind of COND frequently appears in written texts from the 17th century onwards, competing with the subjunctive mood, but only in association with a contextual element expressing indetermination and vagueness.

2.1.2.1.   The epistemic value of the Presumptive is not only seen in assertive-affirmative or dubitative patterns, but also in a **special adversative or concessive conversational matrix** (as in example (13) below), where it also has an *evidential-reportative* value according to the literature (Zafiu 2009: 289–305):[4]

  (13)   ***O fi având** el un doctorat*, dar *nu îmi pare prea deștept.* (adapted from Rocci 2000: 248)
      'He **may have** a PhD, but *he is not too bright.*'
  (14)   ***Om învăța* / *om fi învățând** noi*, dar *tot nu vom reuși să luăm marele premiu* (Tuțescu 2007: 561) – *weakly probable potential* expressed by the Presumptive (Foi and FoiG forms) referring to the present, in adversative/concessive structures.
      '**We may study**, but *we still won't manage to win the great prize.*'

In Romanian, the occurrence of the Presumptive in concessive patterns indicates the strongly subjective involvement of the speaker. However, when viewed in terms of *evidentiality,* these concessive structures indicate the source of the information. This verbal paradigm operates with an *evidential* value, but it represents a genuine *reportative marker*, showing that the speaker (whose opinion appears in the second discursive segment) does not commit to the truthfulness of the information (included in the first discursive segment), which is from a different source, and thought to be uncertain. We are actually dealing with a complex discursive strategy, configured not only by means of the verbal form used, but also based on the concessive discursive frame, showing that "[…] the speaker emphasizes that between p and q, albeit both true, there is incompatibility based on a generalized 'topos'" (Squartini 2012: 2119). For instance, in example (14), the common topos would be as follows: "If you study a lot, you may win (a prize)".

    The same *pragmatic effect of distance* is seen at a cross-phrase, inter-discursive level, where the use of the Presumptive "[…] may help mark a partial agreement to a conversational concession" (Zafiu 2002: 132, our translation), as in (15) and (16). By comparing the examples in (15) with those in (16), a certain scalarity is seen, decreasing in terms of factuality and increasing in terms of the speaker's commitment to the truthfulness of the asserted propositional content:

---

[4]   It is the so-called *concessive FUT* which is also found in Spanish and Italian, but not in French.

(15) A. – *Acum e prea târziu.*
      B. – *Aşa* **o fi,** *dacă zici tu!* (Zafiu 2002: 132)
      'A. – 'Now it is too late. B. – It **may be**, if you say so!'

(16) A. – *E un om dezinteresat, Kyo, aşa să ştii.*
      B. – **O fi fiind** (Zafiu 2002: 132).
      'A. – 'Mind you, he is a disinterested person, Kyo. B. – **He may be**.'

It should be noted that the evidential value is neutralized in explicit concessive structures (see (17)) or in affirmative sentences juxtaposed with similar syntactic structures in the negative form (see (18)), since none of these sentences mentions whether the information is obtained by the speaker through inference or by resorting to a different source.

(17) Chiar dacă **o fi (fiind) vinovat,** *nu se schimbă nimic.* (Zafiu 2002: 138)
      'Even though he **may be guilty**, it doesn't change anything.'

(18) **O fi** *adevărat,* **n-o fi,** *n-avem cum şti.* (Zafiu 2002: 138)
      '**It may be** true, **it may not be**, there is no way of knowing.'

In general, it should also be noted that the two Presumptive forms, Foi and FoiG are interchangeable in every occurrence of this type, apparently functioning with no significant semantic difference. Additionally, neither of these two morphemes may be replaced by the COND present or by the periphrastic structure *aş + fi + gerund* of the lexical verb (*aş fi cântând* – CondG), as seen in (19b):

(19) a. **O fi având / o avea** *partidul acesta câte bube vreţi dumneavoastră,* dar *acum a făcut un lucru bun.* (Zafiu 2002: 132)
          'This party **may be + HAVE**GERUND **/ may have** all the faults in the world, but now they have done something good.'
      b. ??**Ar avea** / ??**ar fi având** *partidul acesta câte bube vreţi dumneavoastră,* dar *acum a făcut un lucru bun.*
          Literal translation: 'This party **would have would be + HAVE**GERUND all the faults in the world, but now they have done something good.'

In fact, in contemporary Romanian, the relation between the Presumptive and the COND forms (including the CondG forms, even though this verbal structure is rarely found in contemporary Romanian discourse) within the epistemic-evidential area is almost impossible to detect. These two morphemes (Presumptive and COND) seem to overlap semantically in reportative uses, but the discursive structures of such values are different: in the first category, i.e. reportative uses, the evidential-reportative value of the Presumptive appears in adversative/concessive structures (see (13), (14) above) and that of the COND (see (9) above) in "journalistic" structures. A comparison between these discursive patterns primarily shows the difficulty (see 19b), or even the impossibility, (20b) of replacing the two morphemes, as well as possibly a distinctive element, i.e. the degree of epistemic commitment/distance (cf. 19a and 20a), in which the COND is the verbal form marked [+inner perspective], [+distance from the narration] (Zafiu 2002: 136).

(20) a. *Se zice că **ar fi bolnav** / **ar fi fiind bolnav***.
      b. ???*Se zice că **o fi bolnav** / **o fi fiind bolnav***.
      Literal translation:
      a. 'They say he **would be sick would be +BE**_{GERUND} **sick**.'
      b. 'They say he **might be sick might be +BE**_{GERUND} **sick**.'

However, it should be underlined that, along with the COND forms, the Romanian
Presumptive is a marker of indirect evidentiality in Willett's classification (1988: 58)
(see also Squartini 2005: 249), even though it is only secondarily compatible with
the reportative function (cf. 20a and 20b). The COND is also not able to express an
inductive or other kind of inference (cf. 21a and 21b).

(21) a. *Luminile sunt aprinse. **O fi ajuns** mai devreme acasă!*
          'The lights are on. **He may have got** home earlier!'
      b. **Luminile sunt aprinse. **Ar fi ajuns** mai devreme acasa!*
          Literal translation: 'The lights are on. He **would have got** home earlier!'

2.2. Romanian lexical means of marking indirect evidentiality

2.2.1. Lexical means of marking inferential evidentiality

These means include a range of adverbs which explain the origin of the infor-
mation asserted in the sentence, but which, in most cases, also have a primary
epistemic modal value, deriving from their still transparent etymological struc-
ture. On a syntactic level, all these lexical units appear either isolated/dislocated
from the remainder of the sentence, by means of intonational pauses, frequently
in middle or final position, but also in initial position and in such cases some may
be combined with the complementizer *că* 'that'. All these lexical units may either
focalize the predication of the entire sentence (functioning as predicative adverbs)
or only a certain discursive sequence from the sentence (operating as a modal
complement). From a semantic perspective, all these lexemes operate as eviden-
tial markers, expressing various facets of *indirect evidentiality*, i.e. the fact that
the information in the asserted sentence was obtained through inference (deduc-
tive, inductive or abductive) or was taken from another source, through citation
(second-hand evidence – hearsay, third-hand evidence – hearsay or even infor-
mation from folklore). However, their primary meaning is modal, subsumed un-
der the area of epistemic logic of belief, oscillating between *probability – possibil-
ity – supposition/doubt*, whereby some of these lexical units operate as pragmatic-
discursive markers.

2.2.1.1.   PESEMNE is a modality adverb with a compound lexical structure, cre-
ated by the agglutination of the preposition *pe* 'on', in this instance with the mean-
ing *pe baza*, *conform* 'based on, according to', and the noun (in the plural) *semne*
'signs'. It was attested with this intrinsic epistemic-evidential value as early as 1710,

by the chronicler *Nicolae Costin* (RDW, s.v. *pesemne*[5]). In contemporary Romanian, *pesemne* mostly operates as (i) *a modalizing adverb indicating the speaker's epistemic attitude* (Zafiu 2020b: 474), assigning the modal value of *probability* to the predication, but also as (ii) *an inferential evidential marker* indicating *a deductive inference* triggered, as shown by its etymological structure, by certain visual cues (Scripnic 2010: 296), explicitly marked in the extralinguistic reality and, implicitly in the discursive structure containing this lexeme; in other words, the information in the speaker's utterance is the result of "the speaker's own suppositions, based on certain cues" (Zafiu 2020b: 474; see also Zafiu 2002: 133, GALR 2008, II: 716–717) or proof, not on inductive reasoning.

These two types of functioning, frequently found in spoken language, initially of a popular and/or familiar nature, are nevertheless conditioned by the combination of this lexical unit with various verbal compartments. Thus, the epistemic value of probability (covered by the modal adverb *probabil* 'probably') appears through an association with various tenses of the indicative mood or a form of quotative conditional (see example (24)). The inferential evidential value, instead, which was present from the first known uses of *pesemne* (see example (22)) and is equivalent to *se pare că, aparent* 'apparently', results from the association of this lexeme with various forms of the indicative and, especially, the Presumptive (see example (25)). This situation proves, on the one hand, the exclusion between the various types of evidential categories, even within the area of indirect evidentiality (incompatibility: *pesemne – quotative COND*) and, on the other hand, the mutual reinforcement of the values of linguistic markers operating in the same semantic-cognitive area (the semantic reinforcement between *pesemne* and *Presumptive forms*).

(22) *Şi Ovidie* **presemne** *dintru acest Plato* a luat *când zicea…* (N. Costin, apud DA/DLR, s.v. *pesemne*)
'**Perhaps** Ovidie *copied* Plato when saying…'

(23) **Pesemne** *că nu știi că pe noi femeile… moartea nici cum* nu ne îngrozeşte? (Negruzzi, 21, apud RDW, s.v. *pesemne*)
'**Maybe** you don't know that we, women… *are not afraid of death at all*?'

(24) *Acolo, sub pământul acela, se odihnea mama ei, pe care o știa doar din spusele altora. Acum nu mai era decât o cruce, care să amintească de prezența ei înainte ca ea să fi părăsit această viața. Ea* **pesemne**, ar fi iubit-o, *ca şi pe mătuşa Domnica, sora tatii, care are ochii blânzi şi plini de lumină,* … (CoRoLa)
'There, in the ground, lay her mother, whom she only knew from the words of other people. Now, nothing else but a cross reminded her of her presence before she left this life. She **probably** *would have loved her*, as she loved aunt Domnica, her father's sister, whose eyes were gentle and full of light…'

(25) *– Aha, făcu Maşa, adăugând în loc de scuză: Dacă s-a auzit un sforăit, atunci* **pesemne** *o fi fost motanul sau Evlampia o fi scos un oftat prin somn… – Cine-i Evlampia? o iscodi vizitatorul. Mai locuieşti cu cineva?* (CoRoLa)

---

[5] With the following diatopic and diachronic values: *pesene, pesine, pisăni, pisene, psîni* (see DA/DLR, s.v. *pesemne*).

'– Aha, Masha said, adding, instead of an excuse: if a snoring was heard, it **probably was** / **must** *have been* the cat or Evlampia *may have sighed* in her sleep… – Who is Evlampia? the visitor inquired. Do you live with someone else?'

For instance, in the sentence in (24), the speaker has an indirect source of information which could be a rumour, public opinion or the viewpoint of other speakers, which may differ from the opinion of the person uttering the sentence at T_0. The speaker "evokes" these opinions (speech acts) suggesting, also through the use of *pesemne*, a certain distance from this primary illocutionary content. In other words, *pesemne* modalizes the enunciative distance of the speaker-utterer from the information asserted in his/her own utterance. However, in (25), *pesemne* suggests that the information in the utterance is obtained via a deductive cognitive process, which implies the visual, auditive, mental, etc. correlation of several contextual cues and/or a comparison between them (for instance, in this case, the snoring is associated with the cat purring or Evlampia sighing in her sleep).

Generally speaking, it is very difficult to clearly differentiate between these two types of use of the analyzed adverb since, as Gabriela Scripnic points out (2010: 294):

> l'adverbe *pesemne* est une unité hétérogène qui a une double fonction : il indique la source de l'information et, en même temps, il met en évidence l'attitude du sujet parlant à l'égard du contenu informationnel, plus précisément l'incertitude quant à la vérité de cette information. (Scripnic 2010: 194)[6]

These meanings are expressed in sentences where *pesemne* can appear parenthetically, generally in a middle position (separated by intonational pauses in oral communication or by commas in writing), but less frequently at the beginning of a sentence (in this case, together with the complementizer *că*, as in example (23), *or* at the end of a sentence (compulsorily preceded by an intonational/graphical pause). In all these cases, *pesemne* can focalize the predication of the entire utterance (see (22), (23), (24) above) or a certain element of the sentence, usually being placed to its right (see example (26)).

(26) *Pe spinarea calului era prinsă strâns în chingi* o desagă, **pesemne *cu ceva merinde*.** (CoRoLa, quoted by Zafiu 2020b: 475)
'*A saddlebag*, **perhaps** with some victuals, was tightly attached to the horse's back.'

From a syntactic point of view, *pesemne* operates either as an adverbial predicate, when associated with the conjunction *că* (see GBLR 2016: 305), or, in the other cases, as a circumstantial of modality (see GALR 2008, II: 253).

2.2.1.2.   POATE is another adverb of modality, a regressive form created through a lexico-semantic transposition from the finite verb *a se putea* < Lat. POTERE (POSSE)

---

6   "The adverb *pesemne* is a heterogeneous unit with a double function: it indicates the source of information and, at the same time, outlines the speaker's attitude regarding the informative content, more specifically the uncertainty regarding the veracity of such information." (our translation).

[evolution: *poate a fi că – poate fi că – poate că – poate* 'it may be that – it may be – may be – maybe' (see Zafiu 2006: 478–490)], which frequently operates as an epistemic modalizer of uncertainty and as a marker of inferential indirect evidentiality, unconnected on a syntactic level and placed parenthetically, at the beginning, middle or end of the sentence: ***Poate** ajunge la timp / Ajunge, **poate**, la timp / Ajunge la timp, **poate*** '**Maybe** he'll be here in time / He'll be here, [**maybe**], in time / He'll be here in time, **maybe**', or, alternatively, syntactically connected through the subordinating conjunction *că*: ***Poate** <u>că</u> ajunge la timp* '**It may be** *that* he'll be here in time' (v. Pană-Dindelegan 2020: 479).

However, unlike the previously analyzed adverb (*pesemne*), *poate*, when used with an epistemic evidential value, expresses an inductive inference that is not realized through contextual cues, but instead achieved through personal reasoning clearly related to the allocentric universe, which may even be speculative. With such values, *poate* is associated with various temporal forms of the indicative (see a form of indicative past in (27), but also with modal forms of the Presumptive (see examples (28) and (29)) and the conditional ((30) and (31)).

(27) *Zâmbi, imaginându-și ce ar fi zis coana Preoteasă: „a fost vrerea lui Dumnezeu"! Și **poate că** așa a fost.* (CoRoLa)
'He smiled, saying what the priestess would have said: 'it was God's wish!' And **maybe** *it was so*.'

(28) *Mama mi-a spus, pe când îi schimbam cămașa: – Cine știe, **poate** o fi un doctor bun. Temperatura a scăzut la treizeci și șapte de grade. Eram atât de fericită, încât am dat fuga la han și …* (CoRoLa)
'Mother told me, as I was changing her shirt: – Who knows, **maybe** *he's a good doctor*. My temperature went down to thirty-seven degrees. I was so happy that I ran to the inn and…'

(29) *Păi, m-au anchetat vreo doi-trei anchetatori, nu numai unul. Acuma nu știu, nu mai există anchetatorii ăia, unii **poate** or fi murit, alții sunt pensionari…* (CoRoLa)
'Well, I was questioned by two or three investigators, not only one. Now, I don't know, those investigators may no longer exist, some of them **ma** *have died*, some are retired…'

(30) *De aceea, spuneam că **poate** ar fi bine să ne gândim serios la un boicot la nivel social-planetar și să nu mai votăm nici un politician corupt din țară sau din parlamentul UE (ca să ne facă de tot râsul), să nu mai plătim 150 de taxe pe an.* (CoRoLa)
'That's why I was saying that **maybe** *it would be good* to seriously think of a social-planetary boycott and no longer vote for corrupt politicians in the country or in the EU Parliament (that would embarrass us), no longer pay 150 taxes a year.'

(31) *Titluri din care, **poate**, ar înțelege mai bine ce altceva decât dragostea pentru guvernatorul lor Băsescu, ar trebui să ne acorde …* (CoRoLa)
'Titles which, **maybe**, *would help them understand* better what else than love for their governor Basescu should grant us…'

2.2.1.3.   PROBABIL, a neologistic borrowing (first attested in 1781 by Samuil Micu-Klein) from the Fr. *probable* and the Lat. PROBABILIS, functions in a manner similar to the previously analyzed epistemic-evidential marker (*poate*). In other words,

probabil is a modalizer within the area of *epistemic possibility*, which can operate as a predicative adverb or as a circumstantial of modality; it can be found alone or in association with the complementizer *că*, in initial, middle or final position in a sentence, focalizing the entire predication or only a certain constituent thereof. The only difference between the two lexical units, namely *poate* and *probabil*, can be seen at the level of the expressed degree of possibility and uncertainty, as *probabil* is closer to *epistemic certainty* (in fact it could be placed on the border between the two modal zones, *certainty* and *possibility*). *Probabil* is also associated with various temporal forms of the indicative (even the past indicative (see (32)), but mostly with future forms (see example (33)) or even the Presumptive (see example (34)). *Probabil* is not incompatible with the COND, as seen in (35), where the modal form expresses a semantic relation of *posteriority*$_{INFERRED}$] in relation to a hypothetical framework (in this case, explicitly expressed by the discursive segment: *chemat să ne călăuzească pașii în ceasul de față* 'summoned to guide our steps at this point' and by the modal operator *probabil* 'probably' which reduces the degree of *epistemic possibility* modalizing this primary propositional content).

(32) *S-a ospătat cât l-au ținut curelele pe tot parcursul drumului până la școală și **probabil** că a făcut chiar indigestie, căci nu a reacționat în nici un fel când eu, cotrobăind orbește prin ghiozdan […], am luat în mână ghemotocul moale, care abia se mai mișca.* (CoRoLa)
'It ate all it could as I went to school and **maybe** *it even got* indigestion because it did not react in any way as I, blindly rummaging through the schoolbag […], grasped the soft fur ball that barely even moved.'

(33) *Date fiind resursele sale, calitatea oamenilor săi și relațiile strategice cu SUA, România **probabil va** intra într-o nouă fază istorică.* (CoRoLa)
'Given its resources, the quality of its people and its strategic relations with the US, Romania will **probably** enter a new historical phase.'

(34) *Ce mai, libertatea ne-a atomizat complet! Ceea ce, **probabil**, o fi ceva natural.* Poate că *artificială va fi fost pseudosolidarizarea dinainte, mai știi?* (CoRoLa)
'What else to say, other than freedom has atomized us completely! Which *could be*, **probably**, something natural. *Maybe* the pseudo-solidarization from before was artificial, who knows?'

(35) *Chemat să ne călăuzească pașii în ceasul de față, el s-ar sufoca, **probabil**, de nesfârșita mizerie morală ce curge din noi.* (Rlit, 2003, apud GALR, 2008, I: 368)
'Summoned to guide our steps at this point, he *would **probably** choke* on the endless moral misery dripping from us.'

As shown in the examples above, *probabil*, when used with an epistemic-evidential value, is able to express both inductive and even speculative inference (as in (34) or (35)), and deductive inference, obtained based on contextual cues (as in (32) or (33)).

2.2.2. Lexical means of marking Quotative/Reportative Evidentiality

2.2.2.1. CICĂ was first attested in Romanian in the 19th century, or to be precise in 1850 (see RDW, vol. I, s.v. *cică*). As determined in the major etymological lexicographical sources of Romanian (also see DELR, vol. II, s.v. *cică*), it was formed from the apheresized agglutinated structure '[*se zi*]*ce* + *că*' [it is said + that], which

consisted of the verbum dicendi *a zice* [to say] < Lat. DICERE used in the 3rd person singular of the present indicative[7] and the complementizer *că* [that]. The first lexicalized occurrences of this structure are found in oral and popular texts, that is in proverbs, sayings, stories and fairy tales.

From a morphological point of view, the analyzed item is an adverb, frequently used in contemporary language in two types of syntactic construction: as a complex sentence adverb with an impersonal meaning, determining either the predication of the sentence or only certain syntactic groups; and as a predicative adverb with an expressed (human) subject (see Zafiu 2020a: 189–192).

Functionally, *cică* has lost its original syntactic component, especially when used at the beginning of a sentence (which is probably its most frequent usage), instead activating its pragmatic, as well as its modal, epistemic component, since it conveys the degree of certainty awarded by the speaker to the asserted propositional content.

The exclusion of the syntactic component, the strong degree of lexicalization and the pragmaticalization of the analyzed item result from the fact that, in contemporary oral language, that is in the colloquial, non-standard register, as well as in written orality, *cică* is sometimes accompanied by the complementizer *că* (only two occurrences are included in CoRoLa) (also see Cruschina Remberger 2008: 104), as in (36), but more frequently by *să,* as in (37). In other discursive situations, *cică* appears as a verb in an impersonal form, as in *cică-se* (= *zice-se că* [it is said that]) (see (38)) or even redundantly preceded by the verb *a zice* [to say] (see (39) below).

(36) *Dragă jurnalule, Sunt foarte foarte supărată pe țara Olanda pentru că e nesimțită și rea și nu o lasă pe țara mea, România, să intre în spațiul Shengen, deoarece **cică că** țara mea este foarte corubtă.* (*Din cultură îmi plac cel mai mult cărțile*, by Simona Tache (2012), in CoRoLa)
   'Dear diary, I am very, very upset with the Netherlands, because this country is evil and a jerk and they do not let my country, Romania, enter the Schengen area, because, *they say that* my country is very corrupt.'

(37) *Auzi, dragă, Îmi zice **că cică să**-mi păstrez și eu una, a zis tanti Coca, un zîmbet ironic i s-a Întins pe față.* (*1989*, by Adrian Buz (2014), in CoRoLa)
   'Listen, dear, *he's saying that* I should keep one, aunt Coca said with an ironic smile covering her face.'

(38) *Grosul din ele atârna la mai mult de o tonă (asta, **cică-se**, le ajuta la urlat).* (*Cei șapte regi ai orașului București*, by Daniel Bănulescu, in CoRoLa)
   'Their largest part weighed more than a ton (*they say* that helped them scream).'

(39) *Avea nevoie de dînșii în călătoria sa la Împăratul-Roș, care, <u>zice</u>, **cică** era un om răutăcios.* (Creangă, *Povești*, in DLRLC, s.v. *cică*)
   'He needed them on his journey to the Red Emperor who, it is said, *apparently* was a bad person.'

---

[7]   Zafiu (2020a: 191) shows that the short form 'ce' of 'zice' ('says') is attested in records of popular oral texts, such as: *s-o dus ș-au bătut în ușă la-mpăratu. Ce: – Poftim, intră! Au intrat* 'they went and knocked on the emperor's door. '*says*: – Come in! They went in' (Bîrlea 1966, II: 128, quoted by Zafiu 2020a: 191). It may be added that the tendency to shorten the form *zice* is also illustrated by the regional variant *ice*, which would represent an intermediate stage between *zice* and *ce*.

The pragmatic-discursive meanings of *cică* are the outcome of a pragmaticalization process that has a relatively short timeframe, probably deriving from the inherent anaphoric and modal core meaning of the original structure. For instance, as shown by Remberger (2015), the evolution of the adverb *cică* towards an evidential discursive unit suggests an intermediate step when the analyzed item had the verbal meaning of 'someone says that …', i.e. it expressed the speech act followed by the reproduction of another speaker's words. The syntactic and semantic independence implied by any process of pragmaticalization is, in this case, the outcome of a topicalization process, determined by the frequent dislocation of the newly created lexeme in an incident or parenthetic position.

In Romanian today, the primary meanings of *cică* can be divided into three categories, namely an evidential reportative meaning, a modal epistemic meaning and a pragmatic-discursive meaning.

For the Rom. *cică*, *evidential reportative meaning* ('it is said that…', 'people say that…', 'as they say, as they believe' – DLRLC, s.v. *cică*) is actually a continuation of the basic etymological meaning, i.e. the 'reproduction of the words of a previous speaker, from which the speaker takes a certain distance' (Ştefănescu 2007: 123, our translation), based on taking information from a source other than the speaker, from the 'words of another speaker' (Zafiu 2002: 127–144; GALR 2008, I: 599, II: 717; GBLR 2016: 634).

In Romanian, the impersonal nature of the original construction underwent a re-analysis and re-interpretation in the pragmaticalization process, from an initial omission of the speaker to an omission of the source of the stated information. The latter was introduced by means of the evidential marker *cică*. In many contexts, the meaning of this reportative marker is semantically equivalent to that of a declarative verb (equivalent to: 'he says (or 'they say') that …', DLRLC, s.v. *cică*). However, in other cases, and in most indices of reportative evidentiality, *cică* also expresses the speaker's reluctance, lack of commitment and epistemic distance from the reproduced information, that is, it also has a modal-epistemic value. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the degrees of certainty vary according to the context and that, as underlined by Zafiu (2020a: 190):

> spre deosebire de alte adverbe şi expresii evidenţiale (ex., 'pasămite', 'chipurile'), care marchează clar neasumarea conţinutului (implicând adesea nonfactualitatea acestuia), 'cică' indică în general o *distanţă epistemică minimă*, variabilă, actualizabilă în funcţie de alte informaţii din context (Zafiu 2020a: 190).[8]

From a syntactic point of view, the evidential reportative meaning of the Rom. *cică* is found in two syntactic discursive patterns (in close proximity to the construction at the source of the analyzed word), i.e.:

---

[8]   "unlike other adverbs and evidential expressions (e.g. 'pasămite', 'chipurile' [allegedly]), that clearly show that the speaker does not commit to the content (and often imply that it is not real), 'cică' generally indicates the minimum epistemic distance, that varies and can be conveyed depending on other information." (our translation).

– in sentences where *cică* is a sentence-modifying adverb with an impersonal meaning, it is frequently used at the beginning or in the middle of the sentence and, most often, next to the predication:

(40) **Cică** *era odată un om însurat, și omul acela trăia la un loc cu soacră-sa.* (Ion Creangă, *Prostia omenească*, Archeus.ro)
'*They say that* a married man once lived, and that he lived with his mother-in-law.'

– in sentences where *cică* functions as a predicative adverb (similarly to 'probably', 'of course', etc.), with an expressed or deducted subject (frequently human), it indicates the exact source of information and has the value of a *verbum dicendi* followed by a complementizer (v. Cruschina/Remberger 2008: 109; Zafiu 2020a: 190). In such cases, *cică* is an explicit marker of indirect or free indirect speech (exclusively a marker of quotation), which partially maintain the meaning of the *verbum dicendi* in the etymological structure.

(41) **Cică** *ar fi reclamat cineva că în bloc se aude muzică populară.* (available at: https://www.digi24.ro/stiri/actualitate/social/mama-unei-fetite-de-2-ani-sanctionata-de-politisti-din-cauza-ca-micuta-face-zgomot-in-apartament-1306345, accessed: 9th January 2023)
'*Allegedly* someone complained about folk music being heard in the building.'

The *modal-epistemic meaning*, marking doubt, a lack of commitment, a lack of trust regarding an opinion, is, hence, strongly dependent upon the context and is typically combined with the previously presented evidential value. Generally, for such epistemic-evidential markers, 'the polyphonic component is weaker than in sentences with the marker of saying, and the epistemic qualification is very low' (Ștefănescu 2007: 144, our translation).

In such contexts, in Romanian, *cică* usually occupies an incident, post-verbal parenthetic position (see (42)) or, more rarely, even a final position. The speaker's epistemic attitude is present in various degrees; this is clearly seen in, for instance, the immediate use of an adversative phrase that cancels the veracity of the information asserted in the previous sentence.

(42) *Cam așa, **cică**, arată noua Dacia Logan 2.* (available at: https://cristianchinabirta.ro/2014/05/24/cam-asa-cica-arata-noua-dacia-logan-2, accessed: 9th January 2023)
'*They say* this is what the new Dacia Logan 2 looks like.'

It can be observed that, with such epistemic implications, the analyzed items can focus an entire sentence, acting as a sentence modifier (as in example (42)) or, more often, influence only a certain segment of the sentence, acting as a constituent modifier, 'modalizing syntactic-nominal (43), prepositional, adjectival (44) or adverbial groups, accompanying them on the left side most frequently' (Zafiu 2020a: 190, our translation).

(43) *Era atlet și **cică** [profesor de sport].* (Zafiu 2020a: 190)
'He was an athlete and, *apparently* [a sports teacher].'

(44)   *Am vorbit cu un meșter **cică** [priceput].* (Zafiu 2020a: 190)
       'I spoke to a foreman, *apparently* [well-trained].'

The *pragmatic-discursive meaning*, with a strong contextual dependence, demon-
strates the high degree of pragmaticalization with respect to *cică* in contemporary
Romanian. *Cică* is specifically used in the opening formulae of fairy tales (45) and
in anecdotes/jokes (46), as well as functioning as an *indicator of the fictionality
of certain types of discourse* (Pop 2017: 180). It is also employed as a marker of
non-paraphrastic rephrasing (see (47)), as an objection marker (mostly appearing
at the end of the sentence that has such a meaning, underlining the speaker's
complete disagreement and irritation) (see (48)), as a marker of accumulation and
pursuit of the discursive topic (metatextual value) (49), and as an indicator of as-
tonishment (50):

(45)   *Amu **cică** era odată într-o țară un crai, care avea trei feciori.* (Ion Creangă, *Povestea
       lui Harap-Alb*, Archeus.ro)
       'Now, *they say* there was once, in a country, a king who had three sons.'
(46)   ***Cică** doi polițiști mergeau pe stradă…*
       '*They say* two policemen were walking in the street…'
(47)   *Și-a venit flăcăul, **cică**, Un voinic cum altul nu e!* (George Coșbuc, DLRLC, s.v. *cică*)
       'And the lad came, *they say* A strong man like no one!'
(48)   *Ori, dacă nu-s ca ei, le tolerează orice grosolănie, îi încurajează, le injectează nesim-
       țirea până dincolo de os, le cultivă prostul-gust și gustul-prost… ca să-și construias-
       că/definească personalitatea, **cică**! Da?* (CoRoLa)
       'And, if they're not like them, they tolerate all the cheekiness, they encourage them,
       they foster their bad attitude and their bad taste… so that they can build/define their
       personality, *they say*! Right?'
(49)   *Aceluia îi dă fata; __ba__ **cică**-i mai dă și jumătate din împărăția lui.* (Creangă, *Povestiri*,
       in DLRLC, s.v. *cică*)
       'He'll give his daughter to that one; *and what's more, they say* he'll also give that
       man half his kingdom.'
(50)   *E oare cu putință? auzi! Apoi **cică** să nu te strici de râs!* (Creangă, *Povestiri*, in DLRLC,
       s.v. *cică*)
       'Is it possible? Hear that! Then *how could one* not laugh like mad!'

2.2.2.2.   Attested in the first part of the 19th century (see RDW, s.v. *păsa*), **PASĂMI-
TE** is composed of *-mite* (an element of Bulgarian origin) and the lexical sequence
pasă, whose etymology is controversial (see Zafiu 2020c: 456, for more details). It is
a modalizing adverb (of popular origin) with a strong evidential-quotative value,
which emphasizes that the information reproduced by the speaker in his/her own
utterance is taken from another source. Consequently, the speaker's relation to it
has a certain reserve and distrust, and such epistemic modal attitudes are also im-
plicitly rendered by the adverb under analysis (Zafiu 2020c: 455). The truth value
of such utterances varies considerably from one context to another, ranging from
strong probability (see (54)) to *unreality* (see (53)). This is why explanatory lexi-
cographical works relating to contemporary Romanian define it either through

synonyms in the area of *evidentiality*, such as *se vede că*, *se pare că*, *pesemne*, or through lexical equivalents in the *epistemic* area, such as *probabil*, *într-adevăr*. In contemporary Romanian, this lexeme appears both in spoken language, in popular and colloquial registers, and in written language, when it has an archaizing tendency (Zafiu 2020c: 456):

(51) *Cântecele de muzică ușoară, recente, spun și ele ceva, fie într-o șovăitoare limbă română, fie într-o avalanșă de anglicisme, căci cuvintele românești au ajuns **pasămite** desuete…!* (CoRoLa)
'Recent pop music also says something, either in an oscillating Romanian language or in an avalanche of Anglicisms, as Romanian words have **apparently** become obsolete…!'

(52) *Și, în ciuda lamentărilor precum că, **pasămite**, „la noi nimic nu funcționează”, eu observ nu numai că totul merge, ci că o face într-un ritm accelerat.* (CoRoLa)
'And, despite complaints *that*, **apparently**, "*nothing works in our country*", I notice not only that everything does work, but that it works quickly.'

(53) *Loretta o sunase pe fosta ei colegă de cameră din facultate, care era, din Întâmplare, redactorul paginii de evenimente diverse de la The Buzz, și ia spus că a descoperit viitoarea „senzație" a lumii scriitoricești. Aceea, **pasămite**, eram eu.* (CoRoLa)
'Loretta had called her old roommate in college who was, coincidentally, the editor of the events page at The Buzz and told her that she had discovered the future writng "sensation". That was, **apparently**, me.'

(54) *Pentru mama, în schimb, crescută într-un sat de munte, cu oameni mândri, neînduplecați și necooperativizați, unde "besereca" era un magnet al întregii comunități, restricția de a participa la slujbe – **pasămite** pentru că era profesoară și trebuia să dea un exemplu de ateism socialist elevilor – nu făcea decât să o întărâte și mai tare.*
'For my mother, instead, who had grown in a mountain village, with proud, strong and independent people, where the church was a magnet for the entire community, the restriction from participating in the mass – **apparently** because she was a teacher and she had to provide an example of socialist atheism to her pupils – irritated her even more.'

In example (52), the speaker underlines the quotative indirect evidentiality through a combination of markers, as quotation markers appear together with *pasămite*, as well as the complementizers *precum* and *că*, which introduce reported speech that is not supported by the speaker.

From a syntactic point of view, as observed in the previous examples, *pasămite* operates without being syntactically connected to the remainder of the sentence, with the conjunction *că*, in an incident, parenthetic or integrated position, often being placed in the middle of the sentence. As seen in (54), the analyzed lexeme also appears in an initial or even final position. As with the other analyzed adverbs, *pasămite* can focalize the entire content of a specific utterance (see (52), (53) or (54)), but can also refer to a single constituent (see (51)).

2.2.2.3.   Originating from the Romanian language (similarly to the equivalent phrases *vezi Doamne* and *dragă Doamne*) and attested in the second half of the 19th century (with the variants: *chip*, *chipuri* or *chipurilea*), **CHIPURILE** could

have developed (see Mîrzea Vasile 2012: 263–289) from the conjunctional phrase *cu chip că*, meaning 'sub pretext că…, sub aparenţa că…' 'under the pretext that…', which was also used with the variants *chip că* or simply *chip* (the noun *chip* was an older borrowing from Hungarian – DA/DLR, s.v. *chip*).[9] It is a modalizing adverb expressing the speaker's lack of support for the information in his/her own utterance, which was taken from an external source. The speaker's distrustful and ironic attitude can also be viewed as complementary nuances in the meaning of this significant lexeme (Zafiu 2020d: 185). As with the previously analyzed adverb (*pasămite*), *chipurile* does not combine with the complementizer *că* 'that' and appears in any position in the sentence (most frequently in the middle).

(55) *Către sfârşitul festinului în cadrul intrării în groapă îşi fac apariţia aschimodiile cu bască, de data asta foarte zâmbitori şi cu priviri galeşe adresate lui Cristi, căruia îi fac gesturi prietenoase invitându-l afară, **chipurile** să-i arate ei ceva frumos la stână.* (CoRoLa) (= "cică")

'At the end of the party, as we have to go into the pit, some creepy people with berets appear, looking happy and sensually at Cristi; they make friendly gestures towards him and invite him outside, **allegedly** to show him something nice at the sheepfold.'

(56) *Pentru că unii scriu on-line, alţii online, iar alţii, **chipurile**, îl „românizează": onlain sau onlein.* (CoRoLa) (= "vorba vine")

'Because some people write on-line, and others online, and others, **so to speak**, adapt it to the Romanian language: onlain or onlein.'

(57) *Greşise, **chipurile**.* (Zafiu 2020d: 185) (= "la drept vorbind")

'He had made a mistake, **to tell the truth**.'

3. Final considerations

This study shows that when analyzing evidential markers, a distinction should be made between grammatical and lexical means that express, in this case, indirect evidentiality.

With regard to the first category, that of *grammatical means*, the Romanian language has both completely grammaticalized structures, which express indirect evidentiality (such as the Presumptive mood), as well as various alternative discursive strategies, such as the use of the COND mood, together with various lexical expressions ('according to X', 'as X says', etc.) and the use of the subjunctive mood in interrogative-dubitative phrases (also accompanied by various modal particles, such as *oare*, *cumva* 'somehow', 'possibly').

In the second category of evidential markers, i.e. *lexical markers*, the Romanian language also has a rich, highly lexicalized system of markers of indirect

---

9   Regarding the etymology of this lexical item, we could consider *chipurile*, as the anonymous reviewer suggested, as a false plural – a kind of folk etymology, with this form perhaps being a modified lexeme of *chipurilea* (cf. *-ilea* as part of other adverbs, e.g. *aci**lea***, *pururi**lea***, *de-a buşi**lea***, etc.).

evidentiality, which can operate both when integrated on a syntactic level and when acting independently, incidentally or parenthetically against the components of the utterance in question. The syntactic and semantic independence, along with their free migration/placement at the utterance level, confirms the clear lexicalization of all these lexemes. Semantic-functional behaviour also arises on a super-segmental level, where these lexemes have to be separated/isolated by means of intonational pauses, marked by commas, which actually suggests the polyphony of such discursive structures.

As for the two categories of indirect evidentiality, an analysis of their lexical markers showed that:

– for *inferential indirect evidentiality*:

    a) the epistemic modal meaning seems to be more apparent on a contextual level, as such lexical markers mostly focalize the validity of the predication (with different degrees of probability/possibility) and, to a lesser extent, the speaker's epistemic attitude;

    b) a certain "specialization" of the lexemes in this micro-system, which is dependent upon the nature of the inferential cognitive process (*pesemne* expresses deductive inference and *poate* and *probabil* express inductive inference);

– for *quotative indirect evidentiality*:

    epistemic distance and distrust are complementary (but, apparently, essential) semantic nuances of the lexical markers in this microsystem, translating the speaker's lack of commitment to the propositional content.

References

Abouda L. 2001. Les emplois journalistique, polémique, et atténuatif du conditionnel. Un traitement unitaire. – Dendale P., Tasmowski L. (eds.). *Le conditionnel en français.* Paris: Klincksieck: 277–29.

Bres J. 2012. Conditionnel et ultériorité dans le passé : De la subjectivité à l'objectivité. – *SHS Web of Conferences* [vol. 1, 3ème Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Française]: 1719–1730.

Călăraşu C. 1987. *Timp, mod, aspect în limba română în secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea.* Bucureşti: Tipografia Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Cruschina S., Remberger E.V. 2008. Hearsay and reported speech: Evidentiality in Romance. – *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 33: 95–116.

Gosselin L. 2001. Relations temporelles et modales dans le conditionnel journalistique. – Dendale, P., Tasmowski L. (eds.). *Le conditionnel en français.* Paris: Klincksieck: 45–66.

Guţu-Romalo V. (eds.). 2008. *Gramatica Limbii Române* (GALR). [vol. 1: *Cuvântul*, vol. 2: *Enunţul*]. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Mîrzea-Vasile C. 2012. Les adverbiaux roum. *în chip …, în mod* 'd'une manière'. Notes synchroniques et diachroniques. – *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57.3: 263–289.

Pană-Dindelegan G. (eds.). 2016. *Gramatica de bază a limbii române* (GBLR). Bucureşti: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

Pană-Dindelegan G. 2020. Poate. – Pană Dindelegan G. (ed.). *Dicționar de interpretări gramaticale. Cuvinte mici, dificultăți mari*. București: Univers Enciclopedic: 476–480.

Pop L. 2017. Du marqueur discursif à marqueur textuel: *Cică* ('on dit que, dit-on') du roumain. – *Pragmalingüística Monográfico* 1: 171–185.

Popescu C.M. 2013a. Conditionnel ou futur dans le passé? L'histoire d'un marqueur de relation anaphorique. – *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur* 123.1: 12–32.

Popescu C.M. 2013b. *Viitorul și condiționalul în limbile romanice. Abordare morfosintactică și categorizare semantică din perspectivă diacronică*. Craiova: Editura Universității din Craiova.

Popescu C.M. 2015. Le 'futur épistémique inférentiel' dans les langues romanes. Une approche contrastive (domaine : français – espagnol – italien – roumain). – *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* 38. [thematic issue coordinated by Abouda L., Azzopardi S., *Le futur*]: 59–76.

Popescu C.M., Duță O. 2017. Presumptive in Romanian language, an evidential and/or epistemic marker. – Marin-Arrese J.I., Lavid López J., Carretero M., Dominguez Romero E., Martín de la Rosa V., Pérez Blanco M. (eds.). *Evidentiality and modality in European languages. Discourse-pragmatic perspectives.* Berlin: Peter Lang: 33–56.

Remberger E.V. 2015. "I didn't say it. Somebody else did." – The Romanian hearsay marker CICĂ. – *Redefining community in intercultural context* 4.1. [Selection of papers presented within 4th RCIC Conference]. Brasov.

Rocci A. 2000. L'interprétation épistémique du futur en italien et en français : une analyse procédurale. – *Cahiers de Linguistique Française* 22 [*Inférences directionnelles, représentations mentales et subjectivité*]: 241–274.

Scripnic G. 2010. Modalité et évidentialité. Le cas de l'adverbe roumain *pesemne* (apparemment). – *Communication interculturelle et littérature* 2.10, 1: 290–296.

Squartini M. 2005. L'evidenzialità in rumeno e nelle altre lingue romanze. – *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 121.2: 246–268.

Squartini M. 2012. Evidentiality in interaction: The concessive use of the Italian future between grammar and discourse. – *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 2116–2128.

Ștefănescu A. 2007. *Conectori pragmatici*. București: Editura Universității din București.

Tuțescu M. 2007. Le 'probable' et le 'possible', valeurs modales prototypiques dans les langues romanes? – Cuniță A., Lupu C., Tasmowski L. (eds.). *Studii de lingvistică și filologie romanică. Hommages offerts à Sanda Reinheimer Rîpeanu*. București: Editura Universității din București: 559–563.

Vet C., Kampers-Manhe B. 2001. Futur simple et futur du passé : leurs emplois temporels et modaux. – Dendale P., Tasmowski L. (eds.). *Le conditionnel en français*. Paris: Klincksieck: 89–105.

Willett T. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. – *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.

Zafiu R. 2002. Evidențialitatea în limba română actuală. – Pană Dindelegan G. (ed.). *Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii române actuale*. București: Editura Universității din București: 127–144.

Zafiu R. 2006. Observații asupra originii și evoluției adverbului modal *poate*. – Sala M. (ed.). *Studii de gramatică și de formare a cuvintelor*. București: Editura Academiei Române: 478–490.

Zafiu R. 2009. Interpretări gramaticale ale prezumptivului. – Zafiu R., Croitor B., Mihail A.M. (eds.). *Studii de gramatică. Omagiu Doamnei Profesoare Valeria Guțu Romalo*. București: Editura Universității din București: 289–305.

Zafiu R. 2020a. Cică. – Pană Dindelegan G. (ed.). *Dicționar de interpretări gramaticale. Cuvinte mici, dificultăți mari.* București: Univers Enciclopedic: 189–192.

Zafiu R. 2020b. Pesemne. – Pană Dindelegan G. (ed.). *Dicționar de interpretări gramaticale. Cuvinte mici, dificultăți mari.* București: Univers Enciclopedic: 474–475.

Zafiu R. 2020c. Pasămite. – Pană Dindelegan G. (ed.). *Dicționar de interpretări gramaticale. Cuvinte mici, dificultăți mari.* București: Univers Enciclopedic: 455–457.

Zafiu R. 2020d. Chip, chipurile. – Pană Dindelegan G. (ed.). *Dicționar de interpretări gramaticale. Cuvinte mici, dificultăți mari.* București: Univers Enciclopedic: 184–185.

Corpora and dictionaries

Archeus.ro = *Electronic resources for the Romanian language*, [available at: http://www.archeus.ro/lingvistica/CautareTextWikisource?query=MERSI&pageNo=1, accessed: 9th January 2023].

CoRoLA = *Computer-based corpus of reference for the contemporary Romanian language*, [available at: http://corola.racai.ro, accessed: 9th January 2023].

DA/DLR = Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" (eds.). 1958–2009. *Dicționarul limbii române. Serie nouă.* București: Editura Academiei Române.

DELR = Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Roseti" A., Giurgea I., Moroianu C. (eds.). 2009. *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române.* Vol. 3. *Litera C.* București: Editura Academiei Române.

DLRLC = Macrea D., Petrovici E. (eds.). 1955–1957. *Dicționarul limbii române literare contemporane.* București: Editura Academiei Române.

RDW = Tiktin H., Miron P. 1986–1989. *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.