

THE GRAMMATICALIZATION AND PRAGMATICALIZATION OF THE
ROMANIAN INDEFINITE PRO-FORMS: A CORPUS-BASED APPROACH

Alice Preda Bodoc and Monica Ardeleanu Gomoescu

Transilvania University of Brasov

[alice_bodoc at yahoo.com](mailto:alice_bodoc@yahoo.com), [gomoescu monica at gmail com](mailto:gomoescu.monica@gmail.com)

Abstract

The present paper aims to explore, and address some issues concerning the Romance diachronic morphosyntax in the light of theoretical and methodological considerations on the grammaticalization and pragmaticalization phenomena, and the question of linguistic change. Building on the previous work concerning grammaticalization, we intend to reveal a pragma-linguistic scenario that accounts for the actual situation of the Romanian indefinite compounds. We consider this subject to be very particular, meaning that the historical development of these pro-forms is not a canonical case of grammaticalization or pragmaticalization.

Key words: grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, indefinite pro-forms, Romanian

Preda Bodoc, Alice and Monica Ardeleanu Gomoescu. 2016.

The grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of the Romanian indefinite pro-forms: a corpus based approach.

Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación 65, 223-256.

<http://www.ucm.es/info/circulo/no65/preda.pdf>.

<http://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/CLAC>

http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rev_CLAC.2016.v65.51987

© 2016 Alice Preda Bodoc and Monica Ardeleanu Gomoescu

Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación (clac)

Universidad Complutense de Madrid. ISSN 1576-4737. <http://www.ucm.es/info/circulo>

Contents

1. Introduction	225
2. Definition, form and etymology of the indefinite pro-forms	225
3. Data and methodology	226
3.1. General considerations on the data	226
3.1. Methodology	227
3.1.1. Grammaticalization	227
3.1.2. Pragmaticalization	228
4. Romanian indefinite pro-forms: results	229
4.1. The Old Romanian language (16 th -18 th c.)	229
4.2. Modern Romanian language (19 th – 20 th c.)	239
4.2.1. Indefinite pro-nouns	239
4.2.2. Pro-adverbs and connectors	241
4.3. The Present-Day Romanian language (21 st c.)	242
4.3.1. Indefinite pro-nouns, also used in some contexts as pro-adjectives and connectors	242
4.4. The grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of the Romanian indefinite pro-forms	245
4.4.1. General considerations	245
4.4.2. Case study – the grammaticalization scenario of the indefinite pro-noun <i>oarece/orice</i>	246
4.4.3. Case study – the grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of the indefinite pro-adverb <i>oricum</i>	249
5. Final considerations	252
Sources and acronyms	253
References	254

1. Introduction¹

Language change, with a focus on grammaticalization and pragmaticalization, is considered to be an essential and universal feature of human language, and, by investigating the laws of language change, we learn a great deal about language in general. As concerns grammaticalization, it has been underlined that the same set of processes and mechanisms are responsible for all aspects of grammar. Thus, all grammatical morphemes have developed out of lexical morphemes, principally nouns and verbs, and all grammatical structures have developed out of more loosely organized constituents (Bybee 2003), as in the case of indefinite pro-forms that developed out of verbs. Above all the controversies relating to the origin of these pro-forms, there are still many questions unanswered regarding the evolution steps and the relation existing between the forms that have coexisted for long periods in language use.

The next four sections of the article define the subject of the present study and describe the forms of these Romanian linguistic items (Section 2), present the methodological framework and some considerations on the data (Section 3), investigate the indefinite pro-forms in three stages of the Romanian language evolution and underline the grammaticalization/pragmaticalization phenomenon (Section 4), and summarize the final considerations (Section 5).

2. Definition, form and etymology of the indefinite pro-forms

Indefinite pronouns are pronouns whose main function is to express indefinite reference. (Haspelmath 1997: 10-11) In our study we will use the cover term *pro-forms* proposed by Haspelmath, comprising pro-nouns, pro-adverbs and pro-adjectives. (Vater 1975 *apud* Haspelmath 1997: 10)

Although the paradigm of these pro-forms in the Romanian language is large, we shall focus only on the indefinite pro-nouns and pro-adverbs constructed with

¹ This paper is supported by the Sectoral Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), ID134378 financed from the European Social Fund and by the Romanian Government.

oare/vare/ori/veri, as these forms have been involved in processes of grammaticalization and pragmaticalization.

The pro-forms analysed here are structured as compounds:

vare/oare/ori/veri ('any' - *proclitic element*) + *care, cine, ce, cât*, ('which', 'who', 'what', 'how much' - *relative pronouns*)

vare/oare/ori/veri ('any' - *proclitic element*) + *unde, când, cum, cât* ('where', 'when', 'how', 'how much' - *relative adverbs*)

From a large number of etymological debates on the roots of the indefinite particles we embrace the perspective that proposes the lat. *volet* (according to the alb. *valle*) as the historical origin of *oare*, while the term *ori* is the result of the transformation of *vare/oare* through some syntactic and phonetic criteria² (Dimitrescu 1974). As it shall be demonstrated in our research, this hypothesis is confirmed by a large number of contexts in which *oare* appears with the disjunctive meaning *ori*.

Analysed from a diachronic perspective, indefinite pronouns are considered to arise from a limited number of sources, the most common being phrases with original meanings such as *whatever it may be*, *it does not matter which*, or *it is the same which*, which come to acquire the 'free choice' function and then spread first to the functions adjacent to it and then to more distant ones (O Dahl 2005).

3. Data and methodology

3.1. General considerations on the data

The corpus analysed in this paper includes 22 texts (religious and laic) in original and translation, comprising over 500,000 words and covering the period of 16th-18th c. For

² Dimitrescu (1974: 175-176) – “Ori nu provine din voles (cf. Rosetti), ci se explică prin criterii fonetice tot din vare/oare. (cf. Candrea, Densuşianu – Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române, 1907-1914).”

[“Ori does not come from voles (according to Rosetti), but it can be explained based on fonetic criteria as originating from vare/oare (according to Candrea, Densuşianu – Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române, 1907-1914).”]

the comparison with the present-day Romanian, we used Romanian grammar and history of the language studies, such as *GALR* (2008), *The Grammar of Romanian* (RG 2013), *Gramatica de bază a limbii române* (GBLR 2010) and *Studii de istorie a limbii române* (SILR 2012). The data extracted has been organized into three periods, reflecting the conventional time division proposed by linguists: Old Romanian (16th–18th c.), Modern Romanian (19th – until the middle of the 20th c.), Contemporary Romanian and Present-day Romanian (second half of the 20th c. - 21st c.).

3.1. Methodology

3.1.1. Grammaticalization

Taking the definitions, the characterizations, and the identified parameters (Lehmann 1995), principles (Hopper 1991) and characteristics (Brinton and Traugott 2005), as a starting point, Beijering (2012) proposes a new approach to grammaticalization in which formal reanalysis³ (language change) and semantic reinterpretation are equally important. She distinguishes between two types of grammaticalization, viz. *primary grammaticalization* (Gzn1) (from lexical to grammatical status), and *secondary grammaticalization* (Gzn2) (from grammatical to (more) grammatical status) and proposes the following definition of grammaticalization:

Grammaticalization is a composite type of language change whereby lexical or already grammaticalized items, in certain linguistic contexts, undergo both semantic reinterpretation and formal reanalysis. It is accompanied by a subset of correlated primitive changes and side effects. Grammaticalization leads to a grammatical item, i.e. a linguistic item belonging to a minor category, with

³ In this paper we take into consideration the following definition of reanalysis given by Beijering (2012: 37): Reanalysis is a covert operation that results in a new structural representation for a given linguistic string that is not immediately noticeable at its surface manifestation. There are different types of reanalysis that apply to different linguistic levels (hierarchical structure, constituent structure and category label), but there is no generally accepted terminology to refer to its subtypes.

relational meaning, secondary status, the prime function of which is to regulate grammatical structure and grammatical relations. (Beijering 2012: 47)

From this perspective, Gzn1 implies categorial reanalyses (formal reanalysis from major to minor category) and reinterpretation (semantic reinterpretation from referential to relational meaning), and it is accompanied by a set of prime changes, such as: loss of morphosyntactic properties (attrition) and loss of semantic substance (bleaching), and followed by side effects: increase in paradigmaticity, structural scope reduction, layering (synchronic variation of a given form), divergence (split), specialization, persistence, context expansion, increased type and token frequency and typological generality (cross-linguistic patterns). On the other hand, Gzn2 implies formal reanalysis from minor to minor category (categorial reanalyses), and semantic reinterpretation of relational meanings, being accompanied mandatorily only by loss of semantic substance (bleaching) and followed by side effects as: increase in paradigmaticity, decrease of paradigmatic variability, structural scope reduction, layering (synchronic variation of a given form), divergence (split), specialization, persistence, productivity increased type and token frequency. (Beijering 2012)

3.1.2. Pragmaticalization

Considering the proposed definitions (Erman and Kotsinas 1993, Diewald 2011) and the identified characteristics (Aijmer 1997) as a departure point, Beijering (2012) proposes a new definition of pragmaticalization (Pgzn):

Pragmaticalization can be thought of as the study of the origin and rise of discourse markers, as well as the gradual diachronic change leading to discourse markers. i.e. a linguistic item with conversational meaning, extrapositional status, the prime function of which is to organize discourse structure. (2012: 56)

Thus, Pgzn implies hierarchical reanalyses, meaning formal reanalysis from propositional to extra-propositional status and semantic reinterpretation from

referential/relational meaning to conversational meaning (= (inter)subjectification⁴), is accompanied by loss of semantic substance (bleaching) and gain of speaker's perspective (subjectification) and is followed by a set of side effects: layering (synchronic variation of a given form), divergence (split), specialization, persistence, productivity (context expansion) and increased type and token frequency (Beijering 2012).

4. Romanian indefinite pro-forms: results

4.1. The Old Romanian language (16th -18th c.)

Starting with the first attested Romanian text – *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* (1500) – we noticed the co-occurrence of the indefinite pro-forms, both composed with *oare* (*vare*) and *ori*. This fact demonstrates that all these compounds formed in an earlier stage of the Romanian language, meaning the Common Daco-Romanian (13th - 14th c.). These were used in spoken language or in texts that have not been conserved until present time, and this explains the free variation of the forms at the beginning of the Old Romanian language.

Basically, the forms identified in the corpus extracted for this period can be organized and analysed as follows:

A. Indefinite pro-nouns, also used in some contexts as pro-adjectives and connectors

- a. *Vare*-series: *vare (în) ce, vare cealea, vare (întru) care, vare (pre) cine, vare (pre) câți, varece/voarece, varecare, varecine, varecât*
- b. *Oare*-series: *oare (prin/în) ce, oare cine, oare care, oarecine, oarecare, oareșcare, oareșicare, oarece, oareceș, oareșce, oarecât, oaricîte, oarecîteva*

⁴ “Subjectification and intersubjectification are metonymic types of semantic change that lead to increased speaker-perspective, attitude or judgment (subjectification) and attention to speaker-addressee interaction (intersubjectification).” (Beijering 2012)

- c. *Ori-series*: *ori (de) cine, ori (asupra) căruia, ori (în/de/pre) care, ori (de/la/în/cu/din/pre/supt) ce, ori (la) câte, oricine, oricare, orice, oricât*
- d. *Veri-series*: *veri cine, veri (în/pentru/cu/de pe/din) ce, veri (întru/din) care, veri cite, vericine, verice, vericarii, vericarele, vericui*

Taking the case of *oarecine/varecine/oricine* ('anyone'), we will show that the pronouns (1) can also be used as pro-adjectives (2) (even in the same text), situation that is very peculiar considering the exclusive pro-nominal use of these forms in the Present-day Romanian language.

- (1) când caută *oarecine* să se îmbogățească
 when tries someone.NOM SĂ_{SUBJ} CL.REFL.ACC grow.rich.SUBJ.3SG
 (FD.1592–1604: 499^v)
 'when *someone* is trying to grow rich...'
- (2) spune că era un om *oarecine*,
 says that be.IMPERF.3SG a man.NOM whosoever.NOM
 ce-l chema Gherminon (FD.1592-1604: 512r)
 who=CL.ACC.M.3SG name.IMPERF.3SG Gherminon.NOM
 '(he) says that there was *a man whosoever* named Gherminon'

In (3) we notice the free variation of *varece* and *oarece* ('anything') in the same phrase from a religious text:

- (3) Și tot *varece* avea, toți porobocii
 and all everything.NOM have.IMPERF.3SG all children.DEF.NOM
 și muierile fuseră prinși, și
 and women.DEF.NOM be.PASS.PS.3PL captured.PPLE.3PL and
 prădară tot *oarece* era în casele
 rob.PS.3PL all anything be.IMPERF.3SG in house.PL.DEF.ACC
 lor (PO. 1582: 34/29)
 their.GEN
 'And they captured *everything* they had, all their children and women, and robbed *anything* they had in their houses.'

There are cases in which the pro-noun functions as head of the NP (4) and is followed by a preposition (*dentre, dintru, den*), or as a noun (5), carrying an indefinite article:

- (4) [GN *oarecine* dintre oameni] cu muiarea ta
 someone.NOM of people.ACC with wife.DEF.ACC your.F.SG
 au vrut să fie” (PO. 1582: 26/10)
 AUX.PERF.3PL want.PPLE SĂ_{SUBJ} be.SUBJ.3SG
 ‘*someone* (of the people) wanted to be with your wife’
- (5) Întru aceale zile să nascu ,
 In those.F.ACC days.ACC CL.REFL be.born.PS.3SG
 un *oarecarile*
 someone.NOM
 Numele lui - Noe (MPI.~fin.17th. c.: 8^v)
 name.DEF.NOM his.GEN Noah.NOM
 ‘Those days, *someone* was born, his name was Noah.’

The prevalent syntactic function of the pro-noun is that of sentence connector, taking sometimes a relative value (6):

- (6) Nime nu știe cine iaste Fiiul, fără
 nobody.NOM not knows who.NOM is Son.DEF.NOM without
 numai Tatăl și *varecui* va vrea
 only Father.DEF.NOM and anyone.DAT AUX.FUT.3SG want.INF
 Fiiul să-i arate. (NT.1648: 234/82^r)
 Son.DEF.NOM SĂ_{SUBJ}=CL.DAT reveal.SUBJ.3SG
 ‘No one knows who the Son is, except the Father, and *anyone* whom the Son wants to reveal himself’

As far as the pro-adjectival use is concerned, the texts revealed two situations: one in which the pro-form is located in front or after the modified noun (7), and another one in which the pro-adjective takes a fixed position - in front of the noun with a preposition (*de, la, în, cu, din, pre, supt, asupra*) interposed between the two elements of the compound pro-form (8):

- (7) să-i arate *oareșcare* semnu.ACC al
 SĂ_{SUBJ}=CL.DAT show.SUBJ.3SG some.ACC sign.ACC AL.M.SG
 dragostii [...] (Fil. ante 1837: 16)
 love.DEF.GEN
 ‘to show him *some* sign of love’

- (8) Și vare în ce oraș veți întra și
 any in what.ACC town.ACC AUX.FUT.3PL enter.INF and
 vă vor priimi, mîncați. (NT.1648: 233/81^v)
 CL.ACC.2PL AUX.FUT.3PL welcome.INF eat.IMP.2PL
 ‘And in *any* town you will get and you will be welcomed, do eat!’

Certain writers prefer the second case, an example being Dosoftei, who, in *Psaltirea în versuri*, makes use of 23 interposed constructions out of 33 contexts with pro-forms.

In some of the contexts in which the pro-forms function as connectors of headed relative clauses, the head is represented by the quantifier *tot* (9):

- (9) *Tot varecine va auzi răde-va*
 all anyone.NOM AUX.FUT.3SG hear.INF laugh.INF=AUX.FUT.3SG
 cu mine (PO. 1582: 21/6)
 with me
 ‘*all anyone* who shall hear would laugh of?/with? me’

In addition, there are some examples in which the pro-form, having a quantificational value, is doubled by another (pseudo)quantifier: *alt* (‘other’) (10), *puțin* (‘little’) (11)

- (10) E alții amu și *alte* *oareceș*
 and others.NOM now and other.F.PL something
 striga. (CPr. 1563: 92)
 scream.IMPERF.3PL
 ‘Now, others were screaming *some (other)* things.’
- (11) Păsați iară și cumpărați *oarece* puțină hrană (PO. 1582: 43/2)
 go.IMP.2PL again and buy.IMP.2PL some little food.ACC
 ‘Go again and buy *some* food.’

Considering the co-occurrence of the pro-forms constructed with *oare* + *care/cine*, we noticed that, apart from their pro-nominal or pro-adjectival use, the forms reveal gender (*oarecarea* for the feminine (12)/ *oarecarele* for the masculine (13)), number (*oarecare* for the singular (14)/ *oarecarii* for the plural (15)) and case (*oarecine* (16)/ *oarecui* (17)) distinctions undertaken only by their relative compound.

- (12) i-au arătat lui o parte
 CL.DAT.3SG=AUX.PERF.3PL show.PPLE he.DAT a part

- oarecare* de norod (Biblia Blaj: 22/41)
 some.DEF.F.SG of people
 ‘...they showed him some part of the people.’
- (13) De corabiia aceasta un înțelept *oarecarele* la
 about boat.DEF.ACC this.F.ACC a wise.man.NOM some.DEF.M.SG to
 arătare vestește (MPI.~mijlocul sec. XVII: 10r)
 vision.ACC tell.PRES.3SG
 ‘When foreseeing the boat, *some* wise man tells them about it’
- (14) *oarecare* înger s-au atins
 some angel.NOM CL.REFL.ACC.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG touch.PPLE
 de dânsul (Biblia Blaj: 19/5)
 of him.ACC
 ‘*some* angel touched him’
- (15) Deci de vor grăi *oarecarii* că fu
 so if AUX.FUT.3PL say.INF anyone.M.PL that was
 lepădat... (MPI.~ middle of the 17th c.: 2^r)
 repulsed.PPLE
 ‘So, if *anyone* will say that he was repulsed...’
- (16) Atinse-se de Mine *oarecine*, că Eu
 touch.PS.3SG=CL.REFL of Me.ACC someone that I.NOM
 cunoscuia că eși puteare den Mine (NT.1648:229/78v)
 know.PS.1SG that come out.PS.3SG power.NOM out.of Me.ACC
 ‘*someone* touched me because I felt a power coming out of me’
- (17) întră în casa *oarecui* de-l
 enter.PS.3SG in house.DEF.ACC someone.GEN that=CL.ACC.3SG
 chiema Iust (NT.1648: 344/159r).
 call.IMPERF.3SG Iust.NOM
 ‘(He) entered *someone*’s house whose name was Iust’

An intriguing case is represented by the use of the form specialized for the masculine with a feminine noun (18):

- (18) Și era acolo o *muiare* *oarecarele*,
 And be.IMPERF.3SG there a woman.NOM some.DEF.M.SG

numele ei – Armatema (MPI.~middle of the 17th c.: 323v)

name.DEF.NOM her.GEN Armatema.NOM

‘And there was this woman, whose name was Armatema’

The *veri-* series was first identified in our data from the 17th c., in the *Bible* from 1688 (Bucharest) (19).

- (19) Invățătoriule, vom ca *verice* vom ceare
 Master.VOC want.PRES.1PL that everything AUX.FUT.1PL ask.INF
 să faci noao. (BB.1688: 782)
 SĂ_{SUBJ} accomplish.SUBJ.2SG us.DAT

‘Master, we want You to accomplish *everything* we will ask you for’

In the 18th c., in some religious texts, these pro-forms appear in free variation with the *oare-* and *ori-* series. So, the *veri-* compounds carry all possible values: with prepositions interposed (20), or having pronominal (21)/adjectival (22) value.

- (20) De acia să ne ferim, *veri* *cu* *ce*
 Therefore SĂ_{SUBJ} CL.ACC.1PL stay away.SUBJ.1PL any with what
 mijloc am putea de păcate (AD.1722–5: 101/96r)
 way.ACC AUX.COND.1PL can.INF of sins.ACC

‘That is why we should stay away of sins, *in every way* we can’

- (21) Că *vericari* din voi nu veți purta de grijă să
 that anyone of you not AUX.FUT.2PL care.INF SĂ_{SUBJ}.
 faceți așa (AIS.1705: 380/39r)
 do.SUBJ.2PL like.this

‘That any of you who will not be careful to do like this...’

- (22) A zecea poruncă zice să nu pohtim
 tenth.FEM Commandment.NOM says SĂ_{SUBJ} not crave.SUBJ.1PL
 verice lucru strein (AD.1722 – 5: 33/30v)
 any thing.ACC foreign

‘The 10th Commandment says that we should not crave for *anything* that is not ours.’

Our research on the old period of Romanian language revealed the early use of the indefinite pro-form as a general extender (23), forms that generalize during the next

periods of language formation. This singular case can represent the first sign of the pragmaticalization process of such pragmatic markers⁵ as the use of the marker implies that there is more to be said, but the author resorts to shared knowledge.

- (23) avem și oarecâteva dobitoace
 have.PRES.1PL also some animals.ACC
 și alte câte oarece (Bert.1774: 236)
 and others some few
 ‘we also have some animals *and some other stuff/things*’

B. Pro-adverbs and connectors

- a. *Vare*-series: *varecum*, *vareunde*, *vareîncotro*, *varecât*, *vare cu cât*,
- b. *Oare*-series: *oarecând(u)*, *oarecum*, *oareunde*, *oare unde*, *oare-încătruo*
- c. *Ori*-series: *oricum*, *oriunde*, *oricând*
- d. *Veri*-series: *veriunde*, *vericât*

As our data confirms, interrogative pronouns represent one of the derivational bases of the indefinite pronouns (Haspelmath 1997) (24), the same being the case of the indefinite pro-adverbs (25):

- (24) *Oare cine-i mai mare întru Împărăția ceriurelor?*
 INT who.NOM=is more big in kingdom.DEF.ACC
 ceriurelor?
 skies.DEF.GEN (NT.1648: 150/22^v)
 ‘*Who* is there bigger in God’s kingdom?’
- (25) *Oare cum vă pare voao de a*
 INT how CL.ACC.2PL feel.PRES you.DAT about AL.F.SG.GEN
 lui tăcere? (Sind.1703: 81r)
 his.GEN silence.ACC
 ‘*How* do you feel about his silence?’

⁵ Pragmatic markers are 'surface phenomena'. On a deeper level they are reflexive i.e. they mirror the speaker's mental processes as envisaged in 'the fabric of talk-in-interaction' commenting on what goes on in the speaker's mind (Redeker 2006) (Aijmer 2013: 4).

The indefinite value of these pro-adverbs overlaps their original meaning expressing time (*vare/oare/ori + când(u)*)(26), place (*vare/oare/ori + unde, vareîncotro, oare-încătruo*) (27), manner (*vare/oare/ori + cum*) (28) or quantity (*vare + cât*) (29).

- (26) *oarecând* *Ț-am* *făcut* *mult* *bine,*
 whenever CL.DAT.2SG=AUX.PERF.1SG do.PPLE much good
adu-ți *aminte! (AA. 1708: 65^r)*
 bring.IMPER.2SG=CL.REFL.2SG to.mind
 ‘remember the *time when* I did you so much good’
- (27) *Eu, oriunde* *și* *la* *ce* *bătăie* *am* *fost,*
 I.NOM anywhere and to what fight.ACC AUX.PERF.1SG be.PPLE
niciodată *nu* *m-au* *biruit (Fil. ante 1837: 10)*
 never not CL.ACC.1SG=AUX.PERF.3PL defeat.PPLE
 ‘*Anywhere* and in any fight I was involved, I have never been defeated’
- (28) *E* *cea* *giupâneasă* *socoti* *să-i* *facă*
 And that.F woman.NOM think.PS.3SG SĂ_{SUBJ}=CL.DAT.3SG do.SUBJ.3SG
moarte *oarecum* *lu* *Amon (FD.1592-1604: 562v)*
 death.ACC somehow LUI.DAT Amon
 ‘And that woman thought to kill Amon *in any way*’
- (29) *Pasă,* *vare cât* *ai* *vinde,* *și*
 try.IMPER.2SG as.much.as AUX.COND.2SG sell.INF and
dă *mișeilor (CC¹.1567: 114^r)*
 give.IMPER.2SG poors.DEF.DAT
 ‘*As much as* you’d sell, try to give to the poor, too’

Due to the fact that these forms were not yet tied, they appeared in free variation and there are contexts in which the pro-adverb *oarecum* (30) is used as *periphrastic marker*⁶:

- (30) *Și* *aceasta* *nebuniia* *vine* *în* *patru* *lucruri*
 and this.F.SG craziness.DEF.NOM comes in four things.ACC

⁶ Our translation of the opération de reformulation. (Rossari 1994)

oarecum: Întâiu, easte că nu caută nice u(n)
 as.follows first is that not considers not one
 lucru (FD.1592-1604: 529v)

thing.ACC

‘And this craziness has four causes, *as follows*: the first one is that he does not consider anything’

The same reason seems to explain the contexts (31) in which this pro-adverb maintains its modal meaning, being in relation with a correlative (*aşa*):

- (31) *Oare cum* au chemat Adam toate jigăniile
 any.how AUX.PERF.3SG name.PPLE Adam.NOM all.F.PL
 jigăniile *aşa* li-e numele. (PO.1582: 2/19)
 animals.DEF.ACC like.that CL.DAT.3PL=is name.DEF.NOM
 ‘*anyhow* Adam calls the animals that shall be their name’

Our data revealed singular cases in which the indefinite pro-adverb is used as a pro-adjective, as in (32):

- (32) easte o *fire* *oarecum* şi trage omul supt
 is a nature somehow and drags man.DEF.ACC under
 fire (FD.1592-1604:469r)
 nature.ACC

‘(that) is some kind of being that drags the man under its power’

There are also situations in which the indefinite pro-adverb *oarecând* (with a temporal meaning) is doubled by the relative time adverb *când* (33):

- (33) - Ba, fătul mieu, că tu ai
 BA_{NEG} son.VOC my.M.SG that you.NOM AUX.PERF.2SG
 fost ca oarecând *cîndu-şi* legă omul
 be.PPLE like anytime when=CL.REFL tie.PS.3SG man.DEF.NOM
 măgariul (AA.1708: 68^v)
 mule.DEF.ACC

‘- You, my son, were in the situation of the man that *anytime when* he tied the mule...’

As compared to the large number (56 occurrences) of pro-nouns and pro-adjectives above mentioned, we discovered only one case of preposition interposed in the indefinite pro-adverbial construction (34):

- (34) *vare cu cât vei cheltui mai mult, eu*
 any with how.much AUX.FUT.2SG spend.INF more much I.NOM
voiu plăti ție. (NT.1648: 235/82^v)
 AUX.FUT.1SG pay.INF you.DAT
 ‘As *much as* you will pay, I will pay it back to you.’

Among these pro-forms, there is the indefinite *vareîncotro/oare-încătruo*, specific only to the Old Romanian language, while its indefinite value is lost in the following language formation stages (35).

- (35) *Aceștea mergu după Miel, vareîncătro*
 these.NOM.M.PL go.PRES.3PL after lamb.ACC anywhere
mearge (NT.1648: 569/313^v)
 goes
 ‘These (men) follows the Son, *anywhere* He goes’

As in the case of pro-nouns, the pro-adverbs can function also as relative connectors, introducing various types of subordinate clauses: locative clause (36), time clause (37) and concessive clause (38).

- (36) *Învățătoriule, mearge-voiu după Tine, vareunde*
 master.VOC follow.INF=AUX.FUT.1SG after You.ACC anywhere
vei mearge (NT.1648: 132/10^v)
 AUX.FUT.2SG go.INF
 ‘Master, I will follow You, *anywhere* You go.’
- (37) *Spre Domnul am nădăjduit Oricând*
 to God.ACC AUX.PERF.1SG hope.PPLE any.time
am fost scârbit (DPV.1673: 24^f)
 AUX.PERF.1SG be.PPLE disgust.PPLE.M.SG
 ‘I put my faith in God / *Any time* I was disgusted’
- (38) *Și m-am veselit de sârg, oricât*
 and CL.REFL.1SG=AUX.PERF.1SG enjoy.PPLE of effort however

mi-au fost de rău (DPV.1673: 153^r)

CL.DAT.1SG=AUX.PERF.3SG be.PPLE of hard

‘And I was cheerful, *however* hard it was’

Considering the *veri-* series, we identified in the corpus only the pro-adverbs: *veriunde* (39), and *vericât* (40), used exclusively as connectors:

(39) *Veriunde* veți intra în casă, acoloa

wherever AUX.FUT.2PL enter.INF in house.ACC there

rămîneți (BB.1688: 778)

stay.IMPER.2PL

‘Wherever you enter the house, stay there’

(40) *vericât* vei cheltui, eu voi plăti

as.much.as AUX.FUT.2SG spend.INF I.NOM AUX.FUT.1SG pay.INF

ție (BB.1688: 799)

you.DAT.2SG

‘As much as you will pay, I will pay it back to you’

4.2. Modern Romanian language (19th – 20th c.)

According to SILR, the situation of the pro-forms in Modern Romanian was slightly different from the previous stage investigated.

4.2.1. Indefinite pro-nouns, also used in some contexts as pro-adjectives and connectors

As far as the indefinite pro-nouns and pro-adjectives are concerned, the authors of SILR noticed that the use of the *ori-* series (*oricine*, *orice*, *oricare*, *oricât*) has been generalized in the 19th century. The pro-noun *oricare*, identified in the previous stage as having variable uses, keeps its variability at the beginning of the century, but the unmarked forms prevail during the entire century. Thus, the forms *oricarea*, *oricarii* disappear and *oricarele* is rarely used.

Considering the *oare-* series, it can be noticed that the form *oarecare* is widely employed during the entire century, while the forms *oarecine*, and *oarece* are rarely

used. As in the case of *oricare*, the pro-noun *oarecare* is used invariable in most contexts.

The situation regarding the interposing of prepositions in the indefinite structure, observed in the previous stage, continues at the beginning of the 19th century, as in the following examples extracted from the reference volume.

- (41) Mărturisim cu cuget curat *ori* *la* *ce*
 confess.PRES.1PL with soul.ACC pure any in what trial
 judecată...
 trial

‘We confess sincerely in *any* trial...’

- (42) *ori* *cu* *ce* feali de marfă *va* avea
 any with what kind of merchandise.ACC AUX.FUT.3SG have.INF
 ‘*any* kind of merchandise will he get’

Although the authors of this volume state that the indefinite pro-forms compound with *veri-* are attested at the beginning of the 19th century in Muntenia (*vericare*, *verice*), but also in Moldova (*verice*, *verce*), the analysis of the Old Romanian corpus revealed the presence of the *veri-* series as early as the 17th century (BB.1688). The grammars of the first half of the 20th century record the forms *vericare*, *vericine*, *verice* as obsolete.

Another aspect specific to this language stage is represented by the occurrence of fewer and fewer cases of prepositions interposed in the compound structures:

- (43) *Ori* *pe* *ce* loc își aşază omul
 Any on what place.ACC CL.DAT.3SG settle.PRES.3SG
 omul cultul.
 man.DEF.NOM religion.DEF.ACC
 ‘In *any* place the man settles his religion’

In the 20th century, the form *oricine* functions only as a pro-noun:

- (44) *Oricine* are dreptul să guste
 anyone havePRES.3SG rightDEF.ACC SĂSUBJ taste.SUBJ.3SG
 ce-i place.
 What.ACC=CL.DAT.3SG likes
 ‘*Anyone* has the right to taste whatever he likes.’

On the other hand, *orice* can take a double function, pronominal (mostly when used as a concessive connector (45)) and adjectival.

- (45) *Orice* *va* *spune* *Biserica* *de* *Apus,*
 anything AUX.FUT.3SG say.INF Church.DEF.NOM of West
lucrurile *stau* *aşa*
 things.DEF.NOM stay.PRES.3PL like.this
 ‘Things stay as they are, *no matter what* the Western Church says’

More and more frequently, the form *orice* appears in quasi-fixed structures, such as:

- (46) *Orice* s-ar zice
anything CL.REFL=AUX.COND.3SG say.INF
'no matter what they say'

A peculiar situation is the one in which *orice* is used with a noun in the plural, situation considered noncompliant with the Romanian grammar norms: *chei pentru orice sertare* ('keys for *any* drawers').

The 20th century texts reveal the possibility of combining the pro-adjective *orice/oricare* with another indefinite form as: *alt*, *altceva*, in order to intensify the indefinite value. In the first two decades of the century the construction is rare (*orice alt cetățean* [‘any other citizen’]), and it starts to increase in number after 1930 (*orice altceva* [‘anything else’]). Comparing this situation with the one found in OR, we can underline the difference in topic preference of the indefinite form *alt*, located in front of the indefinite pro-form, as in (10).

4.2.2. Pro-adverbs and connectors

Among the pro-adverbs, the *oare-* series is more frequently used than the *ori-*, *oarecum* being the form most used within the series. Adding to the forms *vareîncotro/oare-încătruo* specific to the old language, we can notice in this period the presence of the form *ori încătro*:

- (47) *ori încãtro* *mã* *duceam,* *ori unde*
 any where CL.REFL.1SG go.IMPERF.1SG, any where
 eram
 be.IMPERF.1SG
 ‘*anywhere* I went, *anywhere* I was’

So, based on the comparison of the two major periods (OR and MR), we conclude that, beyond the variation of the formal aspects of these pro-forms, the morphosyntactical uses remain, mainly, the same.

4.3. The Present-Day Romanian language (21st c.)

4.3.1. Indefinite pro-nouns, also used in some contexts as pro-adjectives and connectors

From a semantic point of view, these pro-forms are considered to be indefinite quantifiers, as they do not offer information on the exact quantity, but only some hints regarding the part-and-whole relation (*GALR* 2008: 253). Basically, the quantifiers formed with *cine* refer to entities having the [+ Human] semantic value (48.a) while the ones compound with *ce* refer to entities having the [–Human, – Animate] semantic values (48.b).

(48a) *Oricine* poate face asta
 anybody can.PRES.3SG do.INF this.ACC
 ‘Anyone can do this’

(48b) *Ar* face *orice* pentru bani
 AUX.COND.3SG do.INF anything for money.ACC
 ‘He would do *anything* for money’

The pro-forms with *care* refer to entities having the [+/- Human, +Anaphoric] semantic values:

(49) *Oricare* dintre cele / cei prezentate/ prezentați
 Any.NOM from those.F/M.PL show.PPLE
 te-ar putea interesa
 CL.ACC.2.SG=AUX.COND.3.SG can.INF interest.INF
 ‘Any of these [events/men] might interest you’

The ones compound with *cât/câtă* refer to entities having the [+Quantitative, – Countable] semantic values (50a) while the ones with *câți / câte* imply entities with [+Quantitative, +Countable] semantic value (50b)

- (50a) *Oricâtă* înghețată primește, tot mai vrea
 Any.F.SG ice.cream.ACC get.PRES.3.SG still more wants
 ‘No matter how much ice cream he gets, he still wants more’
- (50b) *Oricâte* bomboane primește, tot mai vrea
 any.how.much.F.PL candies.ACC gets still more wants
 ‘No matter how many candies he gets, he still wants more.’

As seen in the previous stages of Romanian, the indefinite pro-nouns can recategorize to nouns with the meaning “unknown person” (51a-b)

- (51a) Nu e un *oarecare*, ci e un mare doctor
 Not is a someone, but is a great doctor.NOM
 ‘He is not just *someone*; he is a well-known doctor’
- (51b) Întru aceale zile să nascu un *oarecarile*,
 in those days.ACC CL.REFL be.born.PS.3.SG a someone.DEF
 numele lui – Noe (MPI.~middle of the 17th c.: 8^v)
 name.DEF.NOM his.GEN Noah
 ‘Those days, *someone* was born, his name – Noe.’

In post-position, the indefinite pro-adjective *oarecare* gets the qualificational meaning „ordinary” (52a), situation that appears as early as the 17th century (52b):

- (52a) E o studentă *oarecare* (GBLR 2010: 153)
 (She)is a student.NOM any.which
 ‘She is an *ordinary* student’
- (52b) Om *oarecarele* era în țara
 man.NOM ordinary be.IMPERF.3.SG in country.DEF.ACC
 Avsitidii, căruia era numele
 Uz.DEF.GEN who.GEN.M.SG be.IMPERF.3.SG name.DEF.NOM
 Iov (BB.1688:362)
 Job.NOM
 ‘There was an *ordinary* man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job’

The indefinite pro-forms can be used in expressing pragmatic strategies – approximation (53a), attenuation (53b) and empathizing (53c) with the interlocutor:

- (53a) Există *oare*ce reticențe
 Exists some reluctances.NOM
 ‘There are *some* reluctances.’
- (53b) Am și eu o *oare*care contribuție
 (I)have.PRES.1SG also I.NOM a certain contribution.ACC
 la toate astea
 to all these.ACC.F.PL
 ‘I do have *a certain* contribution to all these’
- (53c) Ai făcut și tu *oare*ce prostii pe
 AUX.PERF.2.SG do.PPLE also you.NOM some follies.ACC on
 acolo, nu?
 there not
 ‘You did *some* follies there too, didn’t you?’ (GALR 2008: 268)

In Present-Day Romanian, a distinction has been made between the uses of the pro-adverbs: indefinite (modal), relative and others (GBLR 2010: 312), as seen in the following examples (54-57):

Adverb

- (54) Se îmbracă *oricum*
 CL.REFL.ACC dress.PRES.3SG anyway
 ‘She dresses *anyway*’

Modal indefinite adverb+relative

- (55) Se îmbracă *oricum* i se
 CL.REFL.ACC dress.PRES.3SG anyway CL.DAT.M.SG CL.REFL
 cere
 ask.PRES.3SG
 ‘She dresses in *any way* she is requested’

Modal indefinite adverb+relative+concessive

- (56) *Oricum* ai proceda, nu procedezi bine
 whatever AUX.COND.2SG do.INF not do.PRES.2SG right
 ‘*Whatever* you do, you are not doing it right’

Modal indefinite adverb+discourse marker

- (57) *Oricum*, guvernanții nu iau nicio măsură
anyway guvernants.DEF.NOM not take.PRES.3.PL any action.ACC
'The guvernants are not taking any actions, *anyway*.'

4.4. The grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of the Romanian indefinite pro-forms

4.4.1. General considerations

Based on etymological considerations (see 2.1), we developed the following theory concerning the grammaticalization paths of the indefinite pro-forms: *vare* (interrogative particle) + pro-noun/adverb > *vare* (indefinite proclitic element) + pro-noun/adverb > *oare* (interrogative particle/indefinite proclitic element) + pro-noun/adverb > *ori* (indefinite proclitic element) + pro-noun/adverb.

The steps within the grammaticalization path cannot be clearly distinguished, as in the first texts attested for the Romanian language (16th c.) all these forms coexist with all the functions above mentioned. The verbal origin of the interrogative particle *vare* (VOLET) has already been established by previous research on grammaticalization (Dinică and Zamfir 2009), while the interrogative source of the indefinite proclitic element *vare* has been well-argued (Haspelmath 1997). In addition, we consider that this grammaticalization step from the Old Romanian language has been possible due to the morphosyntactic association of the interrogative particle with an interrogative pro-noun (*cine, ce*). Later on, *vare* loses its interrogative meaning, starting the univerbation process of the indefinite pro-forms. The process had several stages of grammaticalization: in the first period, the two elements were unbound (*vare ce, vare cine, vare care*), allowing the interpositioning of a preposition (see examples 41 and 42 above), and it evolved through the stage of a bound indefinite pronoun (*varece, varecine, varecare*).

4.4.2. Case study – the grammaticalization scenario of the indefinite pro-noun *oarece/orice*

vare (interrogative particle) > *vare* (indefinite proclitic element) + *ce* (relative pronoun)
 > (indefinite pro-form, *vare ce/varece/vare* prep. *ce*) > *oare* (interrogative particle/indefinite proclitic element) + *ce* (relative pronoun) (indefinite pro-form, *oare ce/oarece/oare* prep. *ce*) > *ori* + *ce* (indefinite pro-form, *orice, ori* prep. *ce*)

First, we will focus on the essential mechanisms used in grammaticalization, on the primitive changes that occur and on the possible side effects of the process, and then we will comment on the linguistic status (i.e. lexical, grammatical or communicative) and stages of grammaticalization of the Romanian indefinite pro-form *orice*.

The first step in the development of *orice* is represented by the reanalysis of the future-tense auxiliary *vare* into the indefinite element *oare*. Once the indefinite status has been established, *oare* agglutinated to *ce* and developed into *orice*, due to some phonetic reasons, cf. the examples in Section 4.1. The other gradual evolution of *orice* - from the subjunctive verbal form *veri* into the disjunctive connector *ori*, and then into the indefinite pro-noun *orice* – occurred probably simultaneously and closely influenced by these forms already used in the Old Romanian language.

Semantically, there are contiguous, metonymic relations between the various interrogative (58), disjunctive (59), indefinite (60) and concessive (61) meanings of *vare/oare/ori(ce)*, all being nuances in the domain of doubt/uncertainty and approximation.

- (58) *cugeta* *oare ce* *ară* *fi*
 think.IMPERF.3SG INT what AUX.COND.3.SG be.INF
închinarea *aceaia* (NT.1648:212/66^r)
 offer.DEF.NOM that
 ‘she was thinking *what* that offer may be’
- (59) *Noi* *toți* *ne-am* *botezat;* *vare* *jidovi,*
 we all CL.REFL.1PL=AUX.PERF.1PL baptize.PPLE or Jews
vare *grecii,* *vare* *slugile,* *vare* *slobozii.* (NT.1648: 450/234^r)
 or Greeks.DEF or slaves.DEF or free.men.DEF
 ‘We all baptized; *either* Jews, *or* Greeks, *or* slaves, *or* free men’

- (60) Cest fecior du-l cătră muiare
 this.M.SG boy.ACC take.IMP.2SG=CL.ACC.M.SG to woman.ACC
 că are *oarece* a spune lui! (CPr.1563: 113)
 that has something A_{INF} tell.INF he.DAT.M.SG
 ‘Take this boy to the woman, as she has *something* to tell him!’
- (61) Și toate rabdă, *oarece-i* fac
 and all endure.PRES.3SG anything=CL.DAT.M.SG do.PRES.3PL
 (FD.1592-1604: 598^v)

‘And he endures all, *no matter what* they do to him’

The pro-form *oarece* is used in the 16th c., both with quantitative (indefinite and universal) and non-quantitative indefinite meaning, as in: *puțină oarece împărțitură* – *indefinite quantifier* (‘some’); *tot oarece* – *universal quantifier* (‘everything’) and *oarece* lucru bun - *free-choice indefinite pro-adjective* (‘any’).

In the Present-Day Romanian language, the quantificational meaning of *oarece* is blurred, and the [+ indefinite] inherent feature moves towards discursive values (attenuation) (see 62), in order to mitigate the relation between the interlocutors (Vasilescu 2009: 152):

- (62) Am *oarece* îndoieli în legătură cu
 (I) have.PRES.1SG some doubts.ACC in concern to
 veridicitatea cuvintelor tale
 truthfulness.DEF.ACC words.DEF.GEN your.GEN
 ‘I have *some* doubts concerning the truthfulness of your words’

The primitive changes that accompany the formal reanalysis and semantic reinterpretation are represented by the features described in Section 3.2. At the phonetical level, there is some loss of phonological/phonetic substance in the development of the Romanian *orice* from *voare/oarece* (see 2.1). In addition, one may notice some changes in the morphological compositionality, since *orice* is a compositional form, and its internal structure was affected by reduction: *oare* + *ce* > *orice*.

We also notice the loss of morphosyntactic properties due to the shift from indefinite pro-noun to indefinite pro-adjective. The use in the Present-Day Romanian language of

orice as pro-form and sentence connector results in a loss of syntactic variability (the fixation of the pro-adjective in prenominal position) and autonomy (does not allow interpositioning) of the indefinite *orice*. In extension, *orice* starts to be employed more frequently in quasi-phrasal structures (Chivu et al. 2012:517), such as: *orice s-ar zice* ('whatever they say'), *orice s-ar întâmpla* ('whatever it may happen') or it allows the combination with another indefinite pro-form: *orice altceva aş fi făcut* ('anything else I would have done'). As far as the semantic changes are concerned, the data revealed a more bleached meaning of *orice*. It increasingly develops various nuances in the realm of indefiniteness.

As far as *orice* is concerned, the side effects are noticeable. Paradigmaticization⁷ is generally related to productivity and frequency, all being correlated in the development of *orice*. In a general sense, *orice* enters the indefinite pro-noun paradigm, and is a frequent linguistic item. Obligatorification (*decrease of paradigmatic variability* (Beijering 2012: 48)) clearly does not apply to *orice* as it is a free choice element, exception being the concessive connector status. Likewise, condensation⁸ does not occur because the structural scope of *orice* is not reduced.

With respect to layering, we see that the interrogative particle *vare(ce)* was reanalysed as the indefinite proclitic element *ori(ce)*. The indefinite pro-form *ori* can be used to express various dimensions of indefiniteness. It may be used as a relative/concessive sentence connector, or it may occur in set phrases. As regards divergence⁹, it can be observed that the source of *ori(ce)*, the interrogative form *vare(ce)* continued to exist in the 16th c. along with the new indefinite form. Specialization does not apply to *orice*, as similar and simultaneously existing expressions are not reduced to one major expression. Persistence relates to the observation that a linguistic item or construction retains traces of the linguistic item or construction from which it emerged. In the second

⁷ Paradigmaticity is defined as The cohesion of a sign with other signs in a paradigm,(...) that is, the degree to which it enters a paradigm, is integrated into it and dependent on it. (Beijering 2012: 42)

⁸ As defined by Beijering 2012: 108, condensation represents a decrease in syntactic scope, but also an increased dependency.

⁹ When a lexical form undergoes grammaticization to clitic or affix, the original lexical form may remain as an autonomous element and undergo the same changes as ordinary lexical items. (Beijering 2012: 44)

stage of the grammaticalization process, *oare(ce)* retains the properties of the interrogative particle *vare*, but these properties are lost in the case of the indefinite *ori(ce)*.

In conclusion, the patterns show that the development of *orice* has most properties in common with secondary grammaticalization.

4.4.3. Case study – the grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of the indefinite pro-adverb *oricum*

vare (interrogative particle) > *vare* (indefinite proclitic element) + *cum* (relative adverb) (indefinite pro-form, *vare cum/varecum*) > *oare* (interrogative particle / indefinite proclitic element) + *cum* (relative adverb) (indefinite pro-form, *oarecum*) > *ori* + *cum* (indefinite pro-form, *oricum*)

We focus next on the essential mechanisms used in grammaticalization and pragmaticalization, on the primitive changes that occur and on the possible side effects of the process, and then we concentrate on the linguistic status and stages of grammaticalization and pragmaticalization of the Romanian indefinite pro-form *oricum*.

The development of *oricum* has as its initial stage the reanalysis of the future-tense auxiliary *vare* into the indefinite element *oare*. Once the indefinite status has been established, *oare* agglutinated to *cum* and developed into *oricum*, due to phonetic reasons, cf. the examples in Section 4.1.

Based on the examples extracted from the corpus, we established the following grammaticalization path, in which the last stage is considered to be pragmaticalization:

oare(cum) – interrogative adverb (63) > *oare(cum)/ori(cum)* – indefinite pro-adverb (64) > *oarecum/oricum* – sentence connector (65) > *oricum* – discourse marker (66)

- (63) *Oare cum să vinde acel lemnu ce*
 INT how CL.REFL sells that.M.SG wood.DEF.NOM that
 mirosește? (Sind. 1703:113^v)
 smells
 ‘– *How* does the smelling wood sell?’

- (64) Și tu te-i mărit oarecum,
 and you CL.REFL.ACC.2SG=AUX.PERF.2SG grow.PPLE somehow
 căce bătuși pre Darie-Împărat (A.1620: 159)pre
 as defeat.PS.2SG DOM Darius-King.ACC
 ‘And your kingdom grew *somehow*, as you defeated King Darius’
- (65) *oricum* vei vrea, Stăpâne, piiarde-ne
 anyway AUX.FUT.2SG want.INF Lord.VOC
 piiarde-ne pre noi (Biblia Blaj: 10)
 kill.IMP.2SG=CL.ACC.1PL DOM us
 ‘Do *whatsoever* you want with our lives’
- (66) *Oricum*, s-a măritat
 Anyway CL.REFL.ACC.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG get.married.PPLE
 de mult (ILVR)
 from long.time
 ‘*Anyway*, she has got married a long time ago’

The primitive changes that accompany the formal reanalysis and semantic reinterpretation are explained below: at the phonetical level, there is some loss of phonological/phonetic substance in the development of the Romanian *oricum* from *varecum/oareceum* (see 2.1). In addition, one may notice changes in morphological compositionality, since *oricum* is a compositional form, its internal structure being affected by reduction: *oare* + *cum* > *oricum*.

We also notice the loss of morphosyntactic properties, due to the shift from interrogative adverb *vare/oare* to indefinite proclitic element *oare/ori*. The use of *oricum* as a pro-adverb and sentence connector in Present-Day Romanian results in loss of syntactic variability (the adjectival use of these forms in Old Romanian language is lost). In extension, *oricum* starts to appear more in quasi-phrasal structures, such as: *oricum ar fi*.

As far as the semantic changes are concerned, *oricum* has a more bleached meaning, developing various nuances in the realm of indefiniteness and modality: *cumva* (‘somehow’), *într-o oarecare măsură* (‘to some extent’), *în orice fel* (‘in any way’), *măcar* (‘at least’).

Paradigmaticization is generally related to productivity and frequency, all being correlated in the development of *oricum*. In a general sense, *oricum* enters the indefinite pro-adverb paradigm, and is a frequent linguistic item. Obligatorification clearly does not apply to *oricum* as it is a free choice element, exception being the concessive connector status. Likewise, condensation does not occur because the structural scope of *oricum* is not reduced, nor does it become (more) dependent upon other constituents in the clause, rather the opposite. That is, sentence adverbs are integrated into syntactic structures, but flexible with regard to their positions.

With respect to layering, the data show instances of coexistence of both adverbial and subordinating *oricum*. The older *oricum* (with indefinite pro-adverbial properties) still exists along with the newer *oricum* that functions also as a sentence connector. As for the divergence, it can be noticed that the source of *ori(cum)* - the interrogative form *vare(cum)* - continued to exist in the OR besides the new indefinite form. Specialization does not apply to *oricum*, as similar and simultaneously existing expressions are not reduced to one major expression. Persistence relates to the fact that a linguistic item or construction retains traces of the linguistic item or construction from which it emerged. In the second stage of the grammaticalization process, *oare(cum)* retains the properties of the interrogative particle *vare*, but these properties are lost in the case of the indefinite *ori(cum)*.

The pragmatization of the indefinite pro-adverb *oricum* implies hierarchical reanalysis, meaning the shift from a propositional (67) to an extra-propositional (68) status, and reinterpretation from relational to communicative meaning.

(67)	<i>Oricum</i>	să	fie	fost	tălmăcirea
	anyhow	SĂ _{SUBJ}	AUX.SUBJ	be.PPLE	translation.DEF.NOM
	aceasta,	aceasta	cu	adevărat	să
	this.F.SG	this.NOM.F.SG	with	truth	CL.REFL
					knows

(Biblia Blaj, Cuvânt înainte)

‘No matter how this translation was made, it is certain that this was done way before Christ had come’

- (68) *Oricum*, mă ajută cineva să scriu,
 anyway CL.ACC.1SG helps somebody SĂ.SUBJ write.SUBJ.1SG
 că eu nu lucrez la calculator (ILVR)
 as I.NOM not work.PRES.1SG on computer.ACC
 ‘Anyway, somebody will write it for me, I do not use computers, so I will hire
 somebody’

The primitive changes triggered by pragmaticalization manifest at semantic (bleaching) and discourse (increased speaker-perspective, attitude or judgment (subjectification) and attention to speaker-addressee interaction (intersubjectification)) levels. The side effects of the pragmaticalization of *oricum* result in layering and specialization, context expansion and increased frequency.

In conclusion, the patterns show that the development of *oricum* has most properties in common with secondary grammaticalization and pragmaticalization.

5. Final considerations

The purpose of this article was to describe the pragma-linguistic scenario that accounts for the actual situation of the Romanian indefinite compounds. After briefly presenting the current problematic situation of the etymology of the Romanian indefinite pro-forms, we described the main tenets of grammaticalization and pragmaticalization theories, underlining the perspective given by Beijering (2012) who offers quite a novel theoretical frame. The actual analysis focused on the semantic meanings, morphosyntactic and pragmatic functions taken by these forms during the grammaticalization /pragmaticalization paths: *vare* (interrogative particle) + pro-noun/adverb > *vare* (indefinite proclitic element) + pro-noun/adverb > *oare* (interrogative particle/indefinite proclitic element) + pro-noun/adverb > *ori* (indefinite proclitic element) + pro-noun/adverb.

The analysis of the data (comprising texts from 16th – 21st centuries) has shown that the grammaticalization (that started from the Common Daco-Romanian stage of language formation as mentioned by different researchers) and pragmaticalization processes of the Romanian indefinite pro-forms continued and finalized in the Present-Day Romanian language.

Sources and acronyms

- A.1620 –“Alexandria”, ed. F. Zgraon, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2005 (*Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română*, 11).
- AA.1708 –“Archirie și Anadan”, ed. Magdalena Georgescu, București, Minerva, 1997 (*Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română*, II), 157–68.
- AAM.1713 – Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ștrempel, București, 1997.
- AD.1722-5 – Antim Ivireanul, *Didahii*. ed. Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ștrempel, București, 1997, 3–210.
- AIS.1705 – Antim Ivireanul, “Învățătură pe scurt pentru taina pocăinții”, ed. Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ștrempel, București, 1997, 303–19.
- BB.1688 – *Biblia* (București), ed. *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului și Noului Testament*, Patriarhul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1977.
- Bert.1774 –“Bertoldo”,ed. Magdalena Georgescu, București, Minerva, 1999, (*Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română*, III), 157–239.
- Biblia Blaj – *Biblia de la Blaj*, 1795, bitflow.dyndns.org/romanian/Biblia/Romanian-Biblia_Blaj_1795.pdf.
- CC1.1567–8 – Coresi, “Tâlcul Evangheliilor”, ed. Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, București, Editura Academiei, 1998, 31-187.
- CM.1567–8 – Coresi, “Molitvenic”,ed. Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, București, Editura Academiei, 1998, 189-211.
- CPr. 1566–7 – Coresi, “Apostol”,ed. I. Bianu, *Texte de limbă din secolul XVI, IV, Lucrul apostolesc tipărit de diaconul Coresi la 1563*, București, 1930.
- DÎ – *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, ed. Gh. Chivu, M.Georgescu, M. Ioniță, Al. Mareș, Al. Roman-Moraru, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1979.
- DPV.1673 – Dosoftei, *Psaltirea în versuri* (Uniev), ed.: Dosoftei, *Opere*, 1, Versuri, ed. N. A. Ursu, Iași, 1974.
- Fil. ante 1837 – “Istoriia lui Filerot cu Antusa”, ed. Nicolae Cartoian, București, EER, 1974 (*Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română*, II).

FD.1592-1604 – “Floarea darurilor”, ed. Alexandra Roman Moraru, București, Minerva, 1996 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare, I), 119–82.

ILVR – *Interacțiunea verbală în limba română actuală*. Corpus (selectiv). Schiță de tipologie, Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Liliana, Editura Universității din București, 2002

MPI.~middle of the 17th c. – “Palia istorică”, ed. A. Roman Moraru, M. Moraru, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2001 (*Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română*, IV).

NT.1648 – *Noul Testament* (Bălgrad/Alba Iulia), ed. Alba Iulia, 1998

PH.1500–10 – *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*, ed. I. Gheție și Mirela Teodorescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

PO. 1582 – *Palia de la Orăștie*, ed. V. Pamfil, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1968.

Prav.1581 – *Pravila ritorului Lucaci*, ed. I. Rizescu, București, Editura Academiei RSR, 1971.

Sind.1703 – “Sindipa”, ed. Magdalena Georgescu, București, Minerva, 1996 (*Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română*, I), 249– 315.

References

Aijmer, Karin. 2013. *Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Aijmer, Karin. 1997. ‘I think’ - an English modal particle. In Toril Swan and Olaf J. Westvik (eds.), *Modality in Germanic languages. Historical and comparative perspectives*. 1-47. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Beijering, Karin. 2012. *Expressions of epistemic modality in Mainland Scandinavian. A study into the lexicalization-grammaticalization-pragmaticalization interface*. The Netherlands: Wöhrmann Print Service, Zutphen.

Brinton, Laurel and Elizabeth Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bybee, Joan L. 2003. "Cognitive processes in grammaticalization". In Michel Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language*, Volume II., 145-167. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Candrea, I. A. and Ovid Densusianu. 1914. *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*. [The Etymological Dictionary of Romanian Language] București: Librăria Socec & Comp.
- Chivu, Gheorghe. Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela, Dragomirescu, Adina, Nedelcu, Isabela and Nicula Irina. (eds.) 2012. *Studii de Istorie a Limbii Române (Morfosintaxa limbii literare în secolele al XIX-lea și al XX-lea)*. [Historical Studies of Romanian language (The morphosyntax of the literary language in the 19th and 20th centuries)] București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Dahl, Östen. 2005. Indefinite pronouns. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. 588-590. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Diewald, Gabriele. 2011. Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics*, 49(2), 365-390.
- Dimitrescu, Florica. 1974. *Introducere în morfosintaxa istorică a limbii române*. [Introduction to the hystorical morphosyntax of Romanian language] București: Editura Universității.
- Dinică, Andreea, Zamfir, Dana-Mihaela. 2009: Quelques cas de grammaticalisation des formes flexionnelles du verbe a vrea „vouloir” en vieux daco-roumain: les conjonctions et locutions conjonctionnelles disjonctives et concessives (să) veri (că) „ou; soit; soit même; bien que”, săva(i) (că) „idem”. Available at: http://www.unibuc.ro/ro/zamfir_dinica2009_ro (accessed on August 2014)
- Erman, Brit, Kotsinas, Ulla-Britt. 1993. Pragmaticalization: The case of ‘ba’ and you know. *Studier i modern språkvetenskap*. 76-93. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell,.
- Guțu Romalo, Valeria. (ed.) 2008. *Gramatica limbii române*, I, Cuvântul, II, Enunțul. [The Romanian language grammar. I – the word, II – the sentence] București: Editura Academiei.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, volume I. 17-35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Krieb-Stoian, Silvia. 2011. *Mijloace lingvistice de realizare a aproximării în limba română*. [Linguistic methods for creating approximation in Romanian language] București: Editura Universității București.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2002. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Vol. 2. (revised edition). (Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt, No. 9. Erfurt.
- Pănă Dindelegan, Gabriela, Dragomirescu, Adina, Nedelcu, Izabela (eds.) 2010. *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*. [The basic grammar of Romanian language] București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- Pănă Dindelegan, Gabriela. (ed.) 2013. *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1968. *Istoria limbii române*. [The history of Romanian language] București: Editura pentru literatură.
- Rossari, Corinne. 1994. *Les opérations de reformulation. Analyse du processus et des marques dans une perspective contrastive français - italien*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Vasilescu, Andra. 2009. Elemente de dinamică discursivă a pronumelui. In Gabriela Pănă Dindelegan (ed.), *Dinamica limbii române actuale – aspecte gramaticale și discursive*. [Dynamics of nowadays Romanian language] 115-162. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Zafiu, Rodica. 2012. Conectorii disjunctivi din perspectivă semantico-pragmatică: ipoteze asupra proceselor de gramaticalizare. [The disjunctive connectives from a semantic-pragmatic perspective: hypotheses concerning the grammaticalization processes] *Limba Română*, LXI (3), 417 – 428.

Received: January 14, 2015

Accepted: January 30, 2016

Published: February 29, 2016

Updated: March 2, 2016