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, gomoescu monica *at* 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

Contents

1. Introduction[1]

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

---

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 criteria[2] (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, Densusianu – Dicționarul 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, Densusianu – Dicționarul 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 reanalysis[3] (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 categorical 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 primate 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, extrapropositional 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)subjectification[4]), 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) câţi, varece/voarece, varecare, varecine, varecît*

b. *Oare*-series: *oare (prin/în) ce, oare cine, oare care, oarecine, oarecare, oareşcare, oareşicare, oarece, oareceş, oareşce, oarecât, oaricîte, oarecîteva*

---

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 pro-nouns (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: 499ᵛ)

'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)   Şi   tot   *varece*   avea,   toți   porobocii

and   all   everything.NOM   have.IMPERF.3SG   all children.DEF.NOM

şi   muierile   fusără   prinşi,   şi

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*   dentre 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   născu   ,

        In   those.F.ACC   days.ACC   CL.REFL   be.born.PS.3SG a

        un   *oarecarile*

        someone.NOM

        Numele   lui   -   Noe (MPI.~fin.17th. c.: 8ᵛ)

        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   ştie   cine   iaste   Fiiul,   fără

        nobody.NOM   not   knows who.NOM   is   Son.DEF.NOM without

        numai Tatăl   şi   *varecui*   va   vrea

        only   Father.DEF.NOM   and   anyone.DAT   AUX.FUT.3SG want.INF

        Fiiul   să-i   arate. (NT.1648: 234/82ʳ)

        Son.DEF.NOM   SĂSUBJ.=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   *oareşcare*   semnu.ACC   al

        SĂSUBJ=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) Şi   *vare*   *în*   *ce*   oraş   veţi   întra   şi
     any   in   what.ACC   town.ACC   AUX.FUT.3PL   enter.INF   and

     vă   vor   priimi,   mîncaţi.   (NT.1648: 233/81ᵛ)
     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), *puţin* ('little') (11)

(10) E   alţii   amu   şi   *alte*   *oareceş*
      and   others.NOM   now   and   other.F.PL   something

      striga. (CPr. 1563: 92)
      scream.IMPERF.3PL

      'Now, others were screaming *some (other)* things.'

(11) Păsaţi   iară   şi   cumpăraţi   *oarece* puţină 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

oarecarea   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

        cunoscuiu   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 aciia   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 *any*thing 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 markers[5] as the use of the marker implies that there is more to be said, but the author resorts to shared knowledge.

(23) avem   şi   oarecâteva   dobitoace
       have.PRES.1PL   also   some   animals.ACC

       şi   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 Împărăţiia   ceriurelor?
       INT   who.NOM=is   more   big   in   kingdom.DEF.ACC
       ceriurelor?
       skies.DEF.GEN (NT.1648: 150/22ᵛ)

       '*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   tăceare? (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 + cît*) (29).

(26) | *oarecînd* | ţ-am | | făcut | mult | bine, |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| whenever | CL.DAT.2SG=AUX.PERF.1SG | | do.PPLE | much | good |
| adu-ţi | | | aminte! (AA. 1708: 65ʳ) | | |
| bring.IMPER.2SG=CL.REFL.2SG | | | to.mind | | |

'remember the *time when* I did you so much good'

(27) | Eu, | *oriunde* | şi | la | ce | bătaie | 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 cît* | ai | | vinde, | şi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| try.IMPER.2SG | as.much.as | AUX.COND.2SG | | sell.INF | and |
| dă | mişeilor (CC¹.1567: 114ʳ) | | | | |
| 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) | Şi | aceasta | nebuniia | | vine | în | patru | lucrure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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	oarecînd	*cîndu*-şi	legă	omul
	be.PPLE	like	anytime	when=CL.REFL	tie.PS.3SG	man.DEF.NOM

măgariul (AA.1708: 68ᵛ)

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   cît*   vei   cheltui   mai   mult, eu

      any   with   how.much   AUX.FUT.2SG   spend.INF   more much   I.NOM

      voiu   plăti   ție. (NT.1648: 235/82ᵛ)

      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) Aceştea   mergu   după   Miel,   *vareîncătro*

     these.NOM.M.PL   go.PRES.3PL after lamb.ACC anywhere

     mearge (NT.1648: 569/313ᵛ)

     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) Învăţătoriule, mearge-voiu   după   Tine,   *vareunde*

      master.VOC   follow.INF=AUX.FUT.1SG   after You.ACC   anywhere

      vei   mearge (NT.1648: 132/10ᵛ)

      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: 24ʳ)

      AUX.PERF.1SG be.PPLE   disgust.PPLE.M.SG

      'I put my faith in God / *Any time* I was disgusted'

(38) Şi   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: 153ʳ)
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* | veţ | intra | în | casă, | acolea |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| wherever | AUX.FUT.2PL | enter.INF | in | house.ACC | there |

rămîneţ (BB.1688: 778)

stay.IMPER.2PL

 'Wherever you enter the house, stay there'

(40) | *vericât* | vei | cheltui, | eu | voiu | plăti |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| as.much.as | AUX.FUT.2SG | spend.INF | I.NOM | AUX.FUT.1SG | pay.INF |

ţie (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 | marfã | 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 | îşi | 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 cetăţean* ['*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*   *încătro*   mă   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   născu   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 *oaresce*   reticențe

      Exists some   reluctances.NOM

      'There are *some* reluctances.'

(53b) Am   şi   eu   o   *oarecare*   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   şi   tu   *oarece* prostiuțe   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 (16[th.]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.1648:212/66ʳ)
      offer.DEF.NOM   that
      'she was thinking *what* that offer may be'

(59) Noi   toţi   ne-am   botezat;   *vare*   jidovi,
      we   all   CL.REFL.1PL=AUX.PERF.1PL   bapthize.PPLE or   Jews
      vare   grecii,   *vare*   slugile,   *vare*   slobozii. (NT.1648: 450/234ʳ)
      or   Greeks.DEF   or   slaves.DEF   or   free.men.DEF
      'We all bapthized; *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) Şi   toate   rabdă,   *oarece*-i   fac
     and   all   endure.PRES.3SG   anything=CL.DAT.M.SG   do.PRES.3PL

     (FD.1592-1604: 598ᵛ)

     '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 form 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. Paradigmaticization[7] 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, condensation[8] 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 divergence[9], 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

           miroseşte? (Sind. 1703:113ᵛ)

           smells

           '– *How* does the smelling wood sell?'

(64) | Şi | tu | te-i | | mărit | *oarecum,* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and | you | CL.REFL.ACC.2SG=AUX.PERF.2SG | | grow.PPLE | somehow |

căce bătuşi 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 form 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 pragmaticalization 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) *Oricum*   să   fie   fost   tălmăcirea
      anyhow   SĂ_{SUBJ}   AUX.SUBJ   be.PPLE   translation.DEF.NOM
      aceasta,   aceasta   cu   adevărat   să   ştie this.F.SG
      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, Bucureşti, Fundaţia Naţională pentru Ştiinţă şi Artă, 2005 (*Cele mai vechi cărţi populare în literatura română*, 11).

AA.1708 –"Archirie şi Anadan", ed. Magdalena Georgescu, Bucureşti, Minerva, 1997 (*Cele mai vechi cărţi populare în literatura română*, II), 157–68.

AAM.1713 – Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ştrempel, Bucureşti, 1997.

AD.1722-5 – Antim Ivireanul, *Didahii*. ed. Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ştrempel, Bucureşti, 1997, 3–210.

AIS.1705 – Antim Ivireanul, "Învăţătură pe scurt pentru taina pocăinţii", ed. Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ştrempel, Bucureşti, 1997, 303–19.

BB.1688 – *Biblia* (Bucureşti), ed.*Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament*, Patriarhul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, Bucureşti, 1977.

Bert.1774 –"Bertoldo",ed. Magdalena Georgescu, Bucureşti, Minerva, 1999, (*Cele mai vechi cărţi 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 şi molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1998, 31-187.

CM.1567–8 – Coresi, "Molitvenic",ed. Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor şi molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, Bucureşti, 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*, Bucureşti, 1930.

DÎ – *Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea*, ed. Gh. Chivu, M.Georgescu, M. Ioniţă, Al. Mareş, Al. Roman-Moraru, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 1979.

DPV.1673 – Dosoftei, *Psaltirea în versuri* (Uniev), ed.: Dosoftei, Opere, 1, Versuri, ed. N. A. Ursu, Iaşi, 1974.

Fil. ante 1837 – "Istoriia lui Filerot cu Antusa", ed. Nicolae Cartojan, Bucureşti, EER, 1974 (*Cele mai vechi cărţi populare în literatura română*, II).

FD.1592-1604 –"Floarea darurilor", ed. Alexandra Roman Moraru, Bucureşti, 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 Bucureşti, 2002

MPI.~middle of the 17th c. – "Palia istorică", ed. A. Roman Moraru, M. Moraru, Bucureşti, Fundația Națională pentru Ştiință şi 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 i Mirela Teodorescu, Bucure ti, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

PO. 1582 – *Palia de la Orăştie*, ed. V. Pamfil, Bucure ti, Editura Academiei Române, 1968.

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

Sind.1703 – "Sindipa", ed. Magdalena Georgescu, Bucureşti, 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 Romậne (Morfosintaxa limbii literare în secolele al XIX-lea şi 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 sprÍkvetenskap. 76-93. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell,.

Guţu Romalo, Valeria. (ed.) 2008. Gramatica limbii române, I, Cuvântul, II, Enunţul. [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] Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Bucureşti.

Lehmann, Christian. 2002. Thoughts on Grammaticalization. Vol. 2. (revised edition). (Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt, No. 9. Erfurt.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela, Dragomirescu, Adina, Nedelcu, Izabela (eds.) 2010. Gramatica de bază a limbii române. [The basic grammar of Romanian language] Bucureşti: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. (ed.) 2013. The Grammar of Romanian. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosetti, Alexandru. 1968. Istoria limbii române. [The history of Romanian language] Bucureşti: 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 Pană Dindelegan (ed.), Dinamica limbii române actuale – aspecte gramaticale şi discursive. [Dynamics of nowadays Romanian language] 115-162. Bucureşti: 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.