

CONVENTIONAL IMPLICATURE AND LANGUAGE CHANGE: THE ROMANIAN PARADIGM OF IDENTITY

Maria MANOLIU
University of California, Davis

RESUMO

A evolução cíclica dos pronomes românicos de identidade (ex.: însuși e același) fornece dados interessantes para documentar o impacto de fatores pragmáticos na mudança lingüística, uma vez que ela mostra como palavras que trazem implicaturas convencionais semelhantes podem se tornar alternativas adequadas para substituir itens homófonos.

ABSTRACT

The cyclic evolution of the Romanian pronouns of identity (e.g. însuși “self” and același “same”) provides interesting data for documenting the impact of pragmatic factors upon the language change, since it shows how words carrying similar conventional implicatures can become suitable alternates for replacing homophonous items.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Implicatura convencional, co-referencialidade, expectativa, morfema ligado, função pragmática, pronome: - enfático, - interrogativo, - pessoal, - possessivo, - reflexivo; - de identidade; tópico, topicalização.

KEY WORDS

conventional implicature, coreferentiality, expectation, morpheme: bound -, pragmatic function, pronoun: emphatic -, interrogative-, personal -, possessive -, reflexive -; - of identity, topic, topicalization.

The evolution of Lat. *sibi* “REFL-DAT” in Romanian provides interesting data on the cliticization of a full word and its transformation into a bound morpheme.¹ It also shows how homonymic clashes can contribute to the loss of an entire morphemic paradigm and how, thanks to shared pragmatic functions, new alternates may acquire the possibility of carrying the same conventional implicature as the lost items. The development in question can be summarized as follows:

Stage I. In Old Romanian (--16th c.-- 18th c.) *și*, the reflex of Lat. *sibi* “REFL-DAT”, becomes an enclitic bound morpheme expressing “coreferentiality”. Attached to personal pronouns and to deictic expressions (pronouns and adverbials), *-și* served to develop an entire paradigm of means denying an expected non-coreferentiality. After quantifiers and indefinite pronouns it became even a mere intensifier.

Stage II (18th c.--): The bound morpheme *-și* is restricted to a reduced number of combinations, namely the emphatic pronoun *însuși* “self”, the pronoun of identity *același* “same”, and the temporal adverbials *acumși* (now.self), *atunciși* (then.self) “right away”. It is very likely that this limited distribution is due mainly to the ambiguity created by its occurrence in similar contexts to its homophonous possessive dative. The pronoun *însuși* (a compound of the preposition *în*, *întru* “in(to)” + **isu* (cf. Lat. *ipsu* “self, same, he”) + *-și*), becomes the standard expression of “self”.

Stage III (19th c. --): The bound morpheme *-și* is no longer productive. The emphatic pronoun *însuși* “self” becomes unpopular due to its highly irregular morphology and syntactic constraints. Consequently, other means of expressing an unexpected identity such as *singur* “alone” or *chiar* “(it is) clear (that P)” tend to replace it thanks to their shared pragmatic values of denial.

1. Markers of an unexpected identity

1.1 The bound morpheme *-și* and the emphatic pronouns

In Old Romanian (16th c. -18th c.) *și* (< Lat. *sibi* “REFL-DAT”),

with its graphic variants *ſ*, *ſſ*, *ſi*, became an enclitic marker of coreferentiality. The Latin reflexive dative *sibi* was characterized by two features that could predict its further evolution, namely: (i) as a reflexive, it marked the fact that the same referent was assigned two Roles in the given event (one Role being encoded as the syntactic subject in most cases) and (ii) as a dative, it referred mainly to the Experiencer / Beneficiary and was pragmatically exploited in various ways. According to Ernout & Thomas (1972: 184), the Latin reflexive still preserves its etymological meaning of “oneself” (cf. Fr. “soi-même”). Flobert (1975: 387-388) defines the Latin reflexive pronoun as expressions of a high degree of voluntarism (“une volonté délibérée de soi sur soi”). Thanks to this value it can co-occur even with the middle (i.e. the forms in *-r*, so-called deponents, middle or passive forms), which also presupposes the fact that the referent of the subject is both the doer and the undergoer (in Flobert’s words, the form in *-r* represents a “dédoublement du sujet tout à la fois agissant et agi” – see (1)).

- (1) **Me** *nunc* *commoror* (Plaut, *Ps.*: 1131)
 me-ACC now refrain.I-MID
 “as for me, I now refrain [myself]”.

Generally speaking, the dative case on its own carries a special pragmatic connotation, since it points to the most salient constituent after the Agent. As Hyman & Zimmer (1976: 189-212) have pointed out, dative is more marked as to topicalization and focalization processes than any other oblique case. In Givón’s (1984: 139-141) topicalization hierarchy, the semantic role Dative (usually expressed by the dative morphological case) comes immediately after the Agent as the most likely candidate for the topic when the Agent is not specified. This pragmatic connotation must have also contributed to the reinterpretation of the reflexive *-ſi* as a preferred means for reinforcing the emphatic value of the Old

Romanian personal and demonstrative pronouns, first in the dative and then in the accusative.

In Old Romanian (16th c.) the bound morpheme *-și* (cf. Lat. *sibi* “self: DAT”) could be attached to all kinds of pronouns: personal (*luiși* “of/to himself”, *loruși* “of/to themselves”, *mineși* “myself”, *tineși* “yourself”, *noiși* “ourselves”, *voiși* “yourselves”), demonstratives (*același* “that.self”, i.e. “same”), and deictic adverbs (e.g. *acuiși* “now.self”, i.e. “immediately”, etc.). All these forms co-occur synchronically in the Romanian older texts, so the stages of the spread of *-și* as a marker of coreferentiality have to be reconstructed. Within the framework of the extended model of prototypical semantics, it is possible to reconstruct diachronic semantic links on the basis of the synchronic relations between synonymous lexemes (see Kleiber, 1990: 180-181; Geeraerts, 1987). In our opinion, the only possible reasonable scenario for the evolution of Lat. *sibi* in Romanian should present the following sequencing:

First of all, *-și* (*ș*, *șă*) occurred after the dative *lui* (cf. Vulg.Lat. **illui* – Cl. Lat. *illi* “to him”) to express coreferentiality with the subject in contexts where *lui* alone could be ambiguous. As (2) shows, after a noun, *lui* could refer to either (i) two coreferential arguments of the same predicate or (ii) two coreferential arguments of different predicates.

- (2) *tremease elu la satulū lui₁ să pască porcii,*
 sent him to village his to take.care.of pigs
 [...] *și nemica nu deade lui₂* (CÎ:21)
 [...] and nothing not gave him:DAT
 “he sent him to his village to take care of the pigs [...] and gave him nothing”.

In (2) *lui₂* refers to an indirect object previously identified (the prodigal son) and not to the subject of *dade* “gave” [the landlord]. But *lui₁* (in *satulu lui* “his village”) could be decoded as being coreferential with the subject of *tremease* “he sent” only thanks to the

knowledge of the information provided by the whole co-text of the parable. The model for the spread of *-și* from dative to possessives must have been offered by the stressed personal pronoun in the dative (*lui* “of/to him”), which could be either an indirect object or an attribute. This double function of *lui* has been favored by the persistence of the Latin construction called *dativus adnominalis* in Old Romanian (see (3)); cf. Fr. *fils à papa* lit. “son to papa”, i.e. “daddy’s boy”.

- (3) *pentru moarte lui Mihai vodă* (Costin: 83)
 for death he-DAT Mihai king
 “for King’s Michael’s death”.

In (4) the addition of *-și* clearly disambiguates the “possessive” *lui*. The compound *luișu* refers unambiguously to the same person as the subject:

- (4) *toate ispravele părea -i -se*
 all great.things.the seemed-IMPF him:DAT REFL-ACC
că cu puterea luișu că le-au isprăvit
 that with might-the his.REFL that them has.achieved.
 “he thinks that he has achieved great things by his own might” (CÎ:15).

But, as shown by (5), the reflexive possessive adjective *său* “his-MASC.SG” (cf. Lat. *suus*) has in fact the same function of signaling co-referentiality:

- (5) *ori-carele n-are dragoste cătră fratele său* (Înv:513)
 whoever not has love for brother his
 “whoever does not have love for his brother”.

The difference between *luiși* and the reflexive adjective *său* rests on the pragmatic level: as it will be demonstrated below, the

compounds with *-și* (including *luiși*) deny an expected non-coreferentiality, whereas the reflexive adjective *său* does not.

Secondly, the dative compounds offered the model for the spread of *-și* as a marker of coreferentiality to the accusative of the 3rd person (*eluși* “himself-ACC” (see (7)), *eiși* “themselves-ACC” (Înv: 508), and even to other persons: *mineși* “myself-ACC” (Înv: 509), *tineși* “yourself-ACC”, *noiși* “ourselves-ACC” (CÎ:18) — see Densusianu 1961.II: 118-119). The fact that a dative was preferred over the accusative for attributing the pragmatic function of emphasis to personal pronouns is therefore due to both a syntactic factor and its pragmatic functions.

The pronominal compounds with *-și* may refer to a prominent topical constituent that is not the subject of the same clause. In (6), for example, *luișu* marks the unexpected coreferentiality with the topical Experiencer – *i* “him-DAT” (functioning as an indirect object):

- (6) *nu -i vine luișu aciașu foamea* (CÎ: 26)
 not him-DAT comes him- DAT.self right away hunger.the
 “he himself does not feel hungry right away”.

The compound forms with *-și* co-occur frequently with the reflexive pronoun in order to confirm the identity in question, as an emphatic pronoun:

- (7) *iaste nedereptu de carele e prinsu de vreo boală*
 is.it wrong for who.the is caught by any sickness
să se junghe elușu (CÎ: 23)
 that REFL-ACC stab him.REFL
 “It is wrong for the one who falls sick to stab himself”.

According to the maxim of quantity, the shorter utterance (8) would have conveyed the same idea of stabbing, but without the implicature that “according to the ethical principles of the community in question, one is not supposed to do so”.

- (8) *să se junghe*
 that REFL-ACC stabs-he
 “that he stabs himself”.

As I hope to have demonstrated elsewhere (see Manoliu 1994: 192-194), the emphatic pronouns carry the conventional implicature that denies an expectation that the predicate in question applies to non-coreferential arguments. In symbolic logic terms, the expectation denied in (7) may be formulated as follows:

$$\text{EXP}_7: \exists x \exists y (V_{(x, y)}) . \sim (x \equiv y),$$

where \exists is the existential quantifier “there is a...”; x would represent the first argument of the predicate “to stab”, the Agent; y represents the second argument of the predicate “to stab”, the Patient, whereas the symbol \sim represents the denial “it is not true that”. In other words, there is an Agent x and there is a Patient y , and the predicate “kills” applies to x , but it is not true that x is co-referential with y , so the predicate does not apply to two arguments which refer to the same person as both Agent and Patient simultaneously. The meaning asserted by (7) is:

$$\text{S}_7: \exists x \exists y (V_{(x, y)}) . \sim (\sim (x \equiv y)),$$

i.e. “there is an x (the Agent) and a y (the Patient) and it is not true that the predicate ‘to stab’ does not apply to x as both the Agent and the Patient at the same time.” In brief, the expressions of “self” carry the conventional implicature that denies the fact that the predicate applies to two non-coreferential arguments. So it forcefully confirms the coreferentiality of two arguments of the same predicate. In our opinion, this is the reason behind the label ‘pronouns of reinforcement’. In (9), the stressed reflexive accusative *sineși* (= *sine* “him/herself” + *-și*) doubles the first reflexive *se*

(direct object), as a strongly emphatic pronoun:

- (9) *carei se dereptează de sineși*
 who-PL REFL-ACC consider.righteous of self-ACC.self
și ocărăscu pre ceia ce greșescu (CÎ: 14)
 and scolds ACC those who sin.
 “those who think of themselves they are righteous and scold those who sin”.

In (10), *-și* is added even to the possessive adjective *săi* “his/her/their”; compare (5) and (10):

- (10) *iară ei întoarsesă -se întru ai săiși* (CV:254)
 and they went.back REFL-ACC to those/of REFL-PL.REFL-DAT
 “and they went back to theirs (= to their people)”.

1.2 -Și and the identity pronoun “same”

With demonstratives, *-și* has a different function, namely it serves to express the meaning of “same”. In order to explain this change, it is necessary to account for the difference between “same” and “self” in pragmatic terms. Let us thus analyze the utterance (11)²:

- (11) *s' au î gre itu, în același ceasu de*
 if has.he even sinned, in same hour of
acelea păcate se- au și pocăitu ... (CÎ: 18)
 those sins REFL has.he also repented

“even if he sinned, he also repented of his sins within the same hour (right away)”.

The expectation of (11) is that one does not sin and repent so quickly. In brief,

$$\text{EXP}_{11}: \exists x \text{ “he” } \exists y \text{ “hour}_1\text{” } (V_{\sin(x,y)}) \cdot \exists x \exists z \text{ “hour}_2\text{” } (V_{\text{repent}(x,z)}) \cdot \sim (y \equiv z).$$

The asserted meaning of (11) is thus:

$$S_{11}: \exists x \text{ "he"} \exists y \text{ "hour}_1" (V_{sin} \text{ }_{(x,y)}) . \exists x \exists z \text{ "hour}_2" (V_{repent} \text{ }_{(x,z)}) . \sim (\sim (y \equiv z)).$$

In other words, *același* “same” denies the expectation that the referent provided by the world of common beliefs for the argument *y* of the first predicate (“sin”) is not identical with the argument *z* of the second predicate (repent) and asserts that they are identical.

The difference between “self” and “same” may be thus expressed in pragmatic terms as follows: “self” confirms ‘the identity between two arguments of the *same predicate*’, whereas “same” confirms ‘the identity between the arguments of *different predicates*’³.

The reinterpretation of the compound of the distal demonstrative + *-și* as “same” was favored by the following features of the two components. The value of ‘coreferentiality’ brought in by *-și* is conjugated with the focus on the ‘novelty of the referent and/or of the predication’ expressed by the demonstrative. As Kleiber (1992: 623), for example, emphasizes:

Si un locuteur utilise une expression indexicale, c'est-à dire une expression qui déclenche une procédure de repérage spatio-temporel, c'est qu'il juge que son interlocuteur n'a pas encore le référent à l'esprit (cas du référent nouveau) ou qu'il entend le lui faire découvrir sous un aspect nouveau (dans l'hypothèse où le référent est déjà connu).

In brief, the demonstratives are strong signals of inviting the addressee to identify the referent as a new entity or as an already known entity to which a new predicate applies. In other words, in the presence of a demonstrative, the *new predicate* may apply either to (a) an argument coreferential with an argument of a previous predicate or (b) a new referent (when the demonstrative is used as an indexical). Such a context is incompatible with the idea of ‘coreferential arguments of the same predicate’. It is then explicable why the addition of *-și* (confirming coreferentiality) to a

demonstrative (focusing on the novelty of the predicate) will activate meaning (a) and will result in the interpretation of the whole compound as the expression of “same”, which, as already shown, confirms the fact that the argument of one predicate is coreferential with the argument of another predicate. It is perhaps interesting to recall at this point the fact that Lat. *ipse* “self” was also reinterpreted as “same” when co-occurring with demonstratives (see 2.2.1 below). The invariant pragmatic function shared by both “self” and “same” may be defined as “the denial of an expected non-coreferentiality”.

When co-occurring with the proximity demonstrative (as in *acestași*), *-și* is just an additional marker intensifying the cataphoric value of *acest* “this”:

- (12) *Déciia pacea o au legat într- **acestași** chip,*
 Then peace.the it-FEM/ACC have made in this.REFL way
ca să-i fie într-ajutoriu împotriva fiecărui vrăjmaș... (Ureche: 123).
 to help each other against every enemy.”

“Then they made peace in this [very] way (= on the following understanding): to help each other against their enemies”.

When *-și(ă)* is combined with temporal deictic adverbials, the confirmation of ‘identity between two moments’ is reinterpreted as ‘immediateness’ (short span of time between successive events): e.g. *acmușă* “now.REFL” (13); *atunceaș* “then.REFL” (14).

- (13) *că vei **acmușă** muri* (Frag. Tod.:31)
 cause will.you now.REFL die
 “because you soon will die”.

- (14) *și fu **atunceaș** chemat Vasilie* (Moxa:183)
 and was then.REFL called Vasile
 “and Vasile was called right away”.

The spatial deictic *aci* “here” combined with *-și* ends up by also expressing “immediateness”.

- (15) *Și acieși închiseră ușile cerîndu elu se- lu ucigă*.(CV:261)
 And here.INTENS locked doors asking him-ACC that him-ACC kill- SUBJ
 “And they locked the doors right away asking [them] to kill him”.

Combined with *iară* “again” as in *iarăși* “again (and again)”, *-și* reinforces the meaning of ‘repetition’, because *iară* alone was on its way of becoming a weak adversative conjunction (comp. (10) above and (16) below).

- (16) *În deșertu mă laudu, și, ca un mândru, iarăși*
 “In vain myself praise.I, and, as, a haughty [man],” again.self
în deșertu mă laudu! (CÎ: 14)
 in vain myself praise.I!”
 “In vain I praise myself, and, as, a haughty [man], I praise myself
 time and again”.

1.3. –Și as an intensifier

When *-și* is attached to other classes of constituents with no anaphoric function, its pragmatic interpretation as a marker of confirmation is converted into “increase in assertiveness”. In brief, the confirmation marker *-și* becomes an intensifier.

(i) As such, *-și* may follow an indefinite/interrogative pronoun: *cineși* “whoever”, *cinreși*, *cinrescuși* “whoever”; *cinevași* “somebody”, *careși* “each [of them]”, *oareși-care* “any [one]”.

- (17) *cineș va osândi, sine [...] vinovatu se face,*
 who-self will condemn, himself guilty REFL makes
să va avea î lucrure bune multe. (CÎ: 18)
 if would have even deeds good many
 “whoever will condemn, condemns himself [...], even if he has

done good deeds.”

(ii) It may also follow an indefinite quantifier: integral: *totuluș* “whole”; partitive: *cîtuși* [*de puțin*] “however [little]”, or an ordinal numeral: *întîiași/dintîiași* “the very first [time], from the beginning”.

(18) *acela iaste cu totuluș totu cu Dumnezeu*
 that one is with entirely.INTENS entirely with God
 “that one is entirely with God” (Înv.:513)

(19) *Așijderea, întîiași dată au trimis de au luat blagoslovenie*
 In.the.same.way, first time has sent for has taken blessing
de la patriarhii Răsăritului (Ureche:81)
 from patriarchs.the East.the-GEN
 “In the same way, he [very] first sent to get a blessing from the patriarchs of the East”.

2. Stage II (--18thc.): the decay of the bound morpheme *-și*

During the period in question the bound morpheme *-și* becomes restricted to a reduced number of combinations. This reduction is probably due to the following factors:

a. homonymy with its semi-cliticized reflexive variant *ș(i)/î* expressing coreferentiality with the subject, as an indirect object of either the “beneficiary” or the “whole/possessor” (with both alienable and inalienable possessions). The contexts in which the reflexive possessive *-ș(i)/î* occurred after nouns constituted a favorable position in which confusions between the possessive and the emphatic *-și* could arise (see (23) below)

b. other expressions acquire the conventional implicatures carried by the compounds of *-și*, and hence competition between forms (for example, the pronoun *însuși* “himself”, as

an alternate noun modifier, the adjectival *singur* “alone”, the adverbial: *chiar* “even”, etc.).

Let us examine even briefly these concurrent factors.

2.1 SIBI proper: Rom. reflexive dative pronouns

The reflexes of the reflexive dative pronoun Lat. *sibi*, namely *și*, (*ș*, *și*), are first and foremost clitics that could be attached to all kinds of words ending in a vowel. In (20), for example, it is attached to the verb and has the function of an indirect object co-referential with the subject:

- (20) *vine- și întru minte* (CÎ: 21)
 comes self-DAT into mind
 “he comes to his senses”.

The use of the semi-cliticized reflexive variant as the ‘dative of the Whole/Possessor/Beneficiary’ constitutes another factor that undermined the use of the bound morpheme *-și* as a means of reinforcing the pragmatic functions of personal pronouns and deictics. As in other Romance languages, the reflexive of the “whole” could be used in conjunction with the accusative of the parts of the body ⁴:

- (21) *cei ce -și tunseră capetele* (CV:230).
 those who self-DAT shaved heads.the
 “those who shaved their heads”.

But the dative reflexive can also be used for the Beneficiary/Possessor of an alienable possession even when not in contact with the human body:

- (22) *adura- și cărțile* (CV:234).
 collected-he self-DAT books.the
 “he collected his books”.

In no Romanian text does the emphatic *-și* (*ʃi*) occur after a noun, because, on the one hand, the noun does not express co-referentiality by itself and, on the other, it would be in competition with its reflexive homophone expressing Beneficiary/Possessor, as shown by (23) and (24).

- (23) *pre* *voe* **-șu** (CÎ: 23)
 on will REFL-DAT
 “on his own will” i.e. “knowingly”

- (24) *duse* *în* *casa* **-ș** (Moxa: 183)
 took in house REFL-DAT
 “he took [him] to his house”.

Moreover the reflexive indirect object *și/ă* could also be attached to the subject personal pronoun *el/ă* “he”. The contracted form *elu-șă* then becomes homophonous with the emphatic pronoun in the accusative. Compare (25) below and (7) above:

- (25) *elu-șă* *aduse* *aminte* (CÎ: 27.)
 he REFL-DAT brought to.mind
 “he remembered”.

2.2. Lat. IPE - Rom. *însuși*, as an alternate reinforcement pronoun

2.2.1 Lat. IPSE

According to Ernout & Thomas (1972:189), *ipse* “est proprement un intensif, qui s’emploie avec une idée d’opposition latente” (is an intensive proper that is used with an idea of latent opposition). In other words, as any emphatic pronoun, *ipse* may be defined as a signal of “unexpected coreferentiality of two arguments of the same predicate” ⁵. Let us consider the following example:

- (26) *nuntiare iubent regi uelle ipsos ad*
 inform ordered king-DAT want-INF themselves-ACC to
eum mandata perferre (Curtius: 7.8,8).
 him message deliver

“[The ambassadors] ordered that the king be informed that they wanted to deliver the message to him personally”.

In (27) the use of *ipsos* (instead of the mere reflexive accusative *se*) in the ‘accusative + infinitive’ construction implies that the ambassadors might have suspected that somebody did not want to let them deliver their message in person. An even more interesting example of the role of *ipse* in denying an expected non-coreferentiality is provided by (28), where *ipsae* co-occurs with a reflexive pronoun:

- (28) *Valvae [...] se ipsae aperuerunt* (Cicero, *Din.* 1)
 Doors REFL-ACC themselves opened
 “The doors opened by themselves”.

The fact that the doors opened by themselves may not have been considered as an usual phenomenon in the everyday Roman life. According to the maxim of quantity, if such an event would have met the common beliefs, the utterance *valvae se aperuerunt* “the doors opened” would have been the normal choice. But in the given cultural context, characterized by the common belief that an external force has to act for opening doors, *ipse* is a sign of denying the expectation provided by the shared knowledge of a historically determined linguistic community. When combined with other demonstrative pronouns (*hic ipse, iste ipse, ille ipse*), *ipse* is virtually synonymous with *idem* (according to Ernout & Thomas (1972: 191) in such contexts “*ipse se rapprochait de idem*”). In V. Lat. *ipse* alone could also carry the conversational implicature of *idem* “same” as shown by the following utterance:

- (29) *non ipsa parte exire habebamus qua intraueramus* (*Aeth.*, 4. 5)
 not same side go-INF had.to.we which-ABL went.in.we.
 “we did not have to go out the same way we went in”.

In Vulgar Latin, *ipse* started to lose its pragmatic value of “confirming an unexpected coreferentiality”, as shown by its co-occurrence with other “identity markers” such as *-met*: e.g. *egomet ipse* “I.and.nobody.else” + “self” or *metipse* “self.self”; cf. the resulting forms in Romance languages: Fr. *même* “self, same, even”, Sp. *mismo* “same”, Pg. *mesmo*, It. *medesimo* “same, self”.

In spoken Latin *ipse* could replace other demonstratives such as *iste* or *hic* as shown by the corresponding Romance demonstratives: O. Sp. *eje*, Occ. *eis*, O.Pg. *eiso*, Sp. *ese*, Pg. *esse* “this-2nd” Aromanian *nîs*, *năs*, Istroromanian *ăns* “this” (Pușcariu 1957 s.v. 870). In some areas it then became a personal pronoun (cf. It. *essi* “they”), then a focalizer pointing to a salient constituent (see (30)) and even a definite article (cf. Sard. *su* “the”) ⁶

- (30) *Sedens in eadem spelunca, quae in ipsa ecclesia est* (*Aeth.*, 123)
 Sitting in the very cave, which in that church is
 “Sitting in the very cave, which is in the church (we mentioned above)”.

2.2.2 The Romanian emphatic pronoun *însuși*

As a consequence of the loss of its illocutionary force of confirming an unexpected identity, the Romanian pronoun *însu* (deriving from *?in* + *ipsu*) developed into a mere personal pronoun whose anaphoric function was reinforced by the addition of the article *-l* (< Lat. *ille*) as in *însul* (see (31)) and the compound *dînsul* (*de* “from”+ *însul* (see (32))). However its counterpart originating in the demonstrative *ille* “that” took over its functions as in most of the Romance languages, as shown by the fact that already in Old Romanian, *însu* had a very limited distribution. It could occur mainly in combination with a preposition: *într-însu* “in it-MASC”(CV: 248);

într-însa “in it.the-FEM” (Ureche: 94); *pre însul* “on him.the” (Ureche:95); *de înse* “of them-FEM.PL”(Ureche:83), *dentr-însa* “from it.the-FEM.SG”(Ureche:121); cf. Cont. Rom. *într-însul* “in it/him.the-MASC” and *într-însa* “in it/her.the-FEM.”⁷

- (31) *dărise cătr- înșii* (CV 246)
 said.he to them-PL.the-PL
 “he said to them”.

- (32) *cu dînșii* *era* (Nec:36)
 with prep.them-PL.the-PL was
 “with them was...”

The reflexive *-și* was a welcome addition to the pronoun *însu* for expressing the confirmation of “an unexpected coreferentiality of the arguments of the same predicate”. In Old Romanian, the emphatic *însuși* alone could function as a pronoun (see 33), which is unacceptable in modern Romanian (see the corresponding cont. Rom. expression in (34)):

- (33) *e însuș întră întru gloată* (CV: 230)
 and he.self entered into crowd
 “and he himself went to join the crowd”.

- (34) *și el însuși intră în mulțime*
 and he himself entered into crowd
 “and he himself went to join the crowd”.

In (35) *însuș* follows a demonstrative subject:

- (35) *Acesta amu însuș știe* (CÎ: 23)
 This-one now he.self knows
 “This one, you see, knows by himself”.

As an adjective it could also precede its head noun (36).

- (36) *de-abiia au scăpat însuși crainul spre țara sa* (Ureche: 116)
 hardly has escaped he.self king.the towards land.the his
 “even the king hardly escaped to his land”.

It could also double a personal pronoun:

- (37) *voi vedeți înșivă* (CV:229)
 you see.you yourselves
 “you see by yourselves”.

As has been pointed out above, in Old Romanian texts, *însuși* seems to have been the only possible candidate after nouns, since the enclitic *-ș(ă/i)* had the function of a possessive dative (see (23) and (24) above). From nouns, *însuși* must have spread to pronouns, to eliminate also the possible confusion with the contracted form *elu-șă* “he + to.himself” (see (25) above).

3. Stage III: Modern Romanian

3.1. A new paradigm of identity

The rich paradigm of markers of a denied expected non-coreferentiality was reduced to the following combinations, which are also current in contemporary Romanian: *același* “same” (38) and *însuși* “self” (39, 40):

- (38) *îmi spune mereu același lucru*
 me-DAT tells.he time and again same thing
 “he tells me the same thing time and again”.

- (39) *Întrebarea lui, care nu avea decât un răspuns, [...], m-a enervat mai mult*
 His question, which had no answer [...], infuriated me even more

decât **așteptarea** **însăși** și n-am răspuns (CP:17)
 than waiting.the itself-FEM.SG and not-have answered
 “His question, which had no answer, [...], infuriated me even
 more than the waiting in itself and I did not answer”.

- (40) *Dar imediat îmi era rușine de mine însămi* (CP:22)
 But immediately me-DAT was shame of me-ACC myself-FEM
 “But immediately I was ashamed of myself”.

3.2 Stage IV (18th c. --): The decay of the emphatic pronouns

If *același* is still the sole form for “(the) same”(but see Manoliu 1987:421-424 for the tendency for it to be replaced by *tot* “also” + *acela* “that”), *însuși* “self” has a similar fate as its precursors. It becomes vulnerable due to two factors: (a) *morphological complexity*: it has a highly irregular inflexion which has no match in any other nominal paradigm: (i) its gender and number are marked by a change in the stem vowel: -u/ă/i/e-; (ii) its gender agreement is governed by the gender of the referent in the 1st and 2nd persons and by the head noun in the 3rd person; (iii) moreover, the stress falls on the first syllable and, consequently, the complex final markers are unstressed (see the table of its inflexion in (41)) and (b) *syntactic restrictions* (for example, *însuși* cannot occur after a noun in the genitive (see (42)).

(41)	Sg.		Pl.	
	Masc.	Fem.	Masc.	Fem.
1 st pers	<i>însuși</i>	<i>însămi</i>	<i>însine</i>	
2 nd pers.	<i>însuți</i>	<i>însăți</i>	<i>însivă</i>	
3 rd pers.	<i>însuși</i>	<i>însăși</i>	<i>însiși</i>	<i>înseși</i>

- (42) *și-a vândut casa lui **însuși /sa proprie*
 self-DAT has sold house he-GEN himself /his own
 “He sold his own house.”

As shown by (42), when determining a noun, *însuși* is replaced by a complex construction namely: reflexive possessive (*său/sa* “his/her”) + the adjective *propriu* “own”.

Confusions between these forms occur rather frequently in both Old and contemporary Romanian: see O. Rom. (43), where the 3rd person replaces *însuși*, and (44), where it replaces *însuși* (in Gheție 1997: 127), or Cont. Rom. (45), where the singular form replaces the plural *înseseși* (see Iordan et al. 1967: 133).

- (43) *eu însuși știu*, CV, 21
 I self-3rd.PL know
 “I myself know”

- (44) *ca însuși tine* (CT: 98)
 as self-3rd.SG you-ACC
 “as you yourself”

- (45) *însăși cuvintele acestea ...*
 themselves-FEM.SG words-FEM.PL.the-FEM./PL these-FEM.PL
 “these words by themselves...”.

Consequently *însuși* tends to be replaced by other expressions capable of denying an expectation of non-identity, such as *singur* “alone”, “he and nobody else” (<Lat. *singulu-*) or the confirmation adverbial *chiar* (<Lat. *claru-* “[it is] clear [that]”), “even”.

3.3 Adjectival SINGUR “alone”

The core meaning of *singur* (cf. Lat. *singulus*) carries a conventional implicature denying the expectation that an additional participant could be involved in the event, confirming the fact that the given participant and nobody else should be considered for the argument in question. Such a pragmatic value is close enough to the one carried by *însuși*,

which confirms the fact that the predicate applies to two coreferential arguments, excluding any other argument. It is thus explicable that in contexts such as (46) – (48), *singur* is synonymous with *însuși*. As such, *singur* may be found already in old texts as a subject emphatic pronoun and as a modifier of either a personal pronoun or a noun:

(i) as a subject pronoun:

- (46) *Cum* ***singur*** *grăiaște* (Înv.:513)
 As alone says
 “As he himself says”

(ii) following a personal pronoun:

- (47) *să ducă el singur pre feciorul lui Vasilie vodă în scaunul*
 that take he himself on son.the of Vasilie king to throne.the
Țării Muntenești (Costin: 89)
 Country-GEN Muntenia-GEN.
 “to take himself King Vasilie’s son to the throne of the Country of Muntenia”

(iii) preceding a noun:

- (48) *Și încă singur Hristos* *grăiaște* (Înv.: 535)
 and also alone Christ says
 “and also Christ himself says [it]”

In contemporary Romanian, when it functions as a subject, *singur* is preferred to *însuși*.

- (49) *e un om simplu, singur spune, dragă,*
 is.he a man simple, alone says.he, dear,

mie mi-a plăcut mult mai mult în viață paharul decât cartea (GA: VP: 160).
 in my life, I liked more the glass than the book.
 “he is a simple man, even he says so, my dear [man], in my life, I preferred the glass (= drinking) to the book (= learning).”

In (50) *singur* replaces *însuși* after the personal subject pronoun *ea*:

- (50) *Și nu i-au mai făcut nimic, ce să-i mai facă dacă*
 And they didn't do anything to her, what could they do if
ea singură n -a fost în stare
 she alone not -has been capable
să- și vadă de capul ei (GA, DE:41)
 to REFL-DAT' take.care of head hers
 “And they didn't do anything to her, what could they do if even she was not capable of taking care of herself”.

3.2.2. The adverbial *chiar* for *însuși*

Chiar originates in the adverbial use of the adjective (cf. Lat. *clarum* “clear”), with the meaning “(it is) clear (that P)”, as shown by its values in Old Romanian texts: “exactly, clearly, precisely, indeed, truly” (see Densusianu, 1961.2: 165) as well as by some of its contemporary contextual values (see (51)). It has a similar pragmatic function of an emphatic pronoun in the sense that it serves as a marker confirming the truth-value of an utterance referring to an unexpected quality or event.

- (51) *chiar că- i prosta!*
 clear that is.he stupid
 “[it is] clear that he is stupid!”.

In (51), *chiar* serves to deny the expectation that “he is not **that** stupid”. The replacement of *însuși* by *chiar* is explicable in pragmatic

terms, since, in combination with an NP, they may carry a similar conventional implicature that confirms the fact that the predicate applies to an unexpected candidate for the referent of the modified constituent. As examples (52) and (53) show, according to our common beliefs, the “queen” is an unlikely candidate for the argument of the verb “to meet in a coffee shop in Davis”⁸:

- (52) *s'a întâlnit* { a. *cu însăși regina/* } *într-o cafeenea din Davis*
 with herself queen/
 b. *cu regina însăși* }
 with queen herself
- “he met (a), (b) the queen **herself** in a coffee shop in Davis.”
- (53) *s' a întâlni chiar cu regina într-o cafeenea din Davis*
 REFL has met even with queen-the in a coffee shop from Davis
 “he met even the queen in a coffee shop in Davis”.

Conclusions

The theoretical interest of the history of the Romanian emphatic pronouns is two-fold:

1. The cyclic evolution of the emphatic pronouns in Romanian shows how homonymic clashes contribute to the loss of an entire morphemic paradigm and how, thanks to shared pragmatic features (means of denial, confirmation of coreferentiality), new analytical expressions may replace the old forms that become less appropriate for carrying the implicature in question.

2. In agreement with the extended model of prototypical semantics, the split evolution of the reflexive dative pronouns provides interesting evidence for diachronic semantic reconstruction on the basis of attested synchronic variants.

Recebido em março de 2002. Aceito em maio de 2002.

Notes

1. In morpheme-by-morpheme translations we have used the following abbreviations: ACC: accusative, DAT: dative, FEM: feminine, GEN: genitive, IMPF: imperfect, MASC: masculine, MID: middle voice, REFL: reflexive, SUBJ: subjunctive.
2. For the pragmatic function of the emphatic pronouns defined as a means of denying an expected nonidentity or, in other words, a means of confirming an unexpected identity, see Lakoff 1971, Edmonson & Plank 1978, Martin, 1983, Ducrot 1980, Manoliu1994.
3. For the pragmatic functions of the pronouns of identity Fr. *même*, Rom. *aceiași* “same” see Martin 1975 and Manoliu 1997.
4. Cf. It. *si lava le mani*; Fr. *il se lave les mains*, Sp. *se lava las manos*, etc. “he/she washes his/her hands”.
5. For more details concerning the evolution of *ipse* and other demonstratives in V. Lat., see Abel, 1971.
6. See Faingold, 1996:77.
7. The already compound form *dînsul* (*de* “from”+ *însu* + *l* “the”) is rather frequent, especially in Moldavian texts, where it tends to replace the personal pronoun *el* (< Lat. *ille*). Nowadays *dînsul* is considered as a more polite variant of the personal pronoun *el* (<Lat. *illu*), especially in Muntenia.
8. According to Gheție (ed. 1997: 329), examples of the use of *chiar* instead of *însuși* can be found even in Old Romanian texts.

References

1. Corpora:

- Aeth: Silviae uel potius Aetheriae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*, ed. by W. Heraeus, 2nd ed. Heidelberg, 1921.
- Cicero, *Dir.* Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De divinatione, De fato, Timaens*, ed. by Remo Giomini, [Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 46]. Leipzig: Teubner, 1975.

- Cl: Diaconul Coresi. *Carte cu învățătură* (1581), ed. by Sextil Pușcariu and Alexie Procopovici, Bucharest: Socec. & Co., 1914.
- Costin: Miron Costin. *Opere alese. Letopisețul Țării Moldovei. De neamul moldovenilor, Viața lumii* [16th c.], ed. by Liviu Onu, Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1967.
- CP: Camil Petrescu. *Opere*, 3 [1946¹], ed. by Al. Rosetti and Liviu Călin. Bucharest: Minerva, 1981.
- CT: *Tetraevangelul diaconului Coresi* (1561¹), ed. by Timuș Piteșteanu. Bucharest, 1889.
- Curtius: *Q. Curti Rufi Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt*, iterum recensuit Edmundus Hedicke. Editio maior. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908.
- CV: *Codicele Voronețean* [15th-16th cs.], ed. by Mariana Costinescu. Bucharest: Minerva, 1981.
- Frag. Tod.: *Fragmentul Todorescu*, in Gheție, Ion et al., eds. *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1982.
- GA: VP: Gabriela Adameșteanu, *Vară, primăvară*. Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1989.
- GA: DE: Gabriela Adameșteanu, *Drumul egal al fiecărei zile*. Bucharest: Litera, 1992.
- Înv: *Învățăture preste toate zilele* (1642), 1-2, ed. by W. van Eeden, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1985.
- Moxa: Moxa, Mihail, *Cronica universală* (17thc.), ed. by G. Mihăilă. Bucharest: Minerva, 1989.
- Nec: Ion Neculce. *Opere. Letopisețul Țării Moldovei și O samă de cuvinte* [18th c.], ed. by Gabriel Ștrempel. Bucharest: Minerva, 1982
- Plaut, Ps: Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Pseudolus*, edited by M.M. Wilcock. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1987.
- Ureche: Grigore Ureche, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei* [16th c], ed. by Liviu Onu. Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1967

2. Secondary sources.

Abel, Fritz 1971. *L'adjectif démonstratif dans la langue de la Bible latine*.

- Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Densusianu, Ovidiu. 1961. *Istoria Limbii române*. 1. *Originile*, 2. *Secolul al XVI-lea*, ed. by J. Byck. Bucharest: Editura Științifică.
- Ducrot, Oswald. 1980. "Pragmatique linguistique", *Le langage en contexte. Etudes philosophiques et linguistiques de pragmatique*, ed. by Herman Parret: 487-575. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Edmonson, J.A. & Plank, F. 1978. "Great Expectations: an intensive self-analysis", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2. 373-413.
- Ernout, Alfred and François Thomas. 1972. *Syntaxe latine*, 2e éd. corr. et rev. Paris : Klincksieck.
- Faingold, Eduardo D. 1996. "Demonstrative Pronouns and Definite Article in Latin and the Romance languages", *Papere zur Linguistik*. 54.1: 67-82, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Flobert, David. 1975. *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne* (Publications de la Sorbonne, Série NS, Recherches, 17). Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Geerarts, D. 1987. "Cognitive Grammar and the History of Lexical Grammar," *Topics in Cognitive Grammar* ed. by Rudzka, B., 643-673: Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gheție, Ion et al., eds. 1997. *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532-1780)*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax. A Functional Typological Introduction*. I, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hymann, L. and K.E. Zimmer 1976. "Embedded topic in French", *Subject and Topic*, ed. by Li Charles. New York, San Francisco & London: Academic Press.
- Iordan, Iorgu, V. Guțu-Romalo, and Al. Niculescu. 1967. *Structura morfologică a limbii române contemporane*. Bucharest, Editura Științifică.
- Kleiber, Georges 1990. *La sémantique du prototype*, Paris: P.U.F.
- Kleiber, Georges 1992. "Anaphore-Deixis: deux approches concurrentes", *La deixis*. Colloque en Sorbonne (8-9 juin 1990) ed. by Mary-Annick Morel and Laurent Danon-Boileau, 613-623.

- Paris: P.U.F.
- Lakoff, Georges 1971. "On generative Semantics," *Semantics. An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics, and Psychology*, ed. by Steinberg, Danny David and Leon A. Jakobovits, 232-296. London & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1987 "From conversational to conventional implicature. The Romanian pronouns of identity and their substitutes". *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Anna Giacalone Ramat, Onofrio Carruba & Giuliano Bernini, 419-429. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Manoliu-Manea Maria. 1994, *Discourse and Pragmatic Constraints on Grammatical Choices. A Grammar of Surprises* (=North Holland Linguistic Series 57), Amsterdam, Lausanne, New York, Oxford, Shannon & Tokyo: Elsevier.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1997. "La pragma-sémantique de l'identité," *Relations anaphoriques et (in)cohérence*, ed. by Mulder, Walter de, Liliane Tasmowski-De Ryck, Carl Vetters, 201-220. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Martin, Robert. 1975. "Sur l'utilité du mot *même*", *Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature* 13.2: 227-243.
- Martin, Robert. 1983. *Pour une logique du sens*. Paris: P.U.F.
- Pușcariu, Sextil. 1975. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache: Lateinisches Element mit Berücksichtigung aller romanischen Sprachen*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.