Split Grammaticalization: Romanian *iar*, Adverb and Conjunction

Maria MANOLIU-MANEA*

Key-words: *expectation, implicature, discourse markers, pragmatic models, adversative conjunctions, language change*

As it has been already emphasized, adversative conjunctions carry a conventional implicature denying an expected (non-)identity between the predicates of the connected sentences. They differ in the way they impose certain constraints on their expectations, as well as to the result of their denial in the assertion (see Manoliu-Manea 2013). In what follows, we intend to present an interesting case of split grammaticalization by which the proper meaning of an adverb became the denied expectation of an adversative conjunction. It is the case of Romanian *iar*, which, according to various etymological dictionaries, has a controversial origin:

(a) Rom. *de + (i)ar(a)* [Cioranescu et al. s.v. 2779]

(b) Rom. reconstructed *deara* < lat. *de vero* [Tiktin & Miron 2001 : 49];

(c) Lat. *de ea re* (Meyer-Lübke 1968 : 2513; Meyer-Lübke 1972 : v. iii, §492).

Interesting enough, it has corresponding forms in other Romanian dialects: Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian *ară* 'and, again, contrary to, against' and also in other Romance varieties such as Engadin *eir* 'also, and', Occitan *era, eras* 'also, too'. Puşcariu (1905 : 65 s.v. 756) mentions the existence of similar items in Greek ('έρα, άρα, lit. 'even, and, but'), which might signal a preroman origin (see also Meyer-Lübke 1968 and Tiktin & Miron 2001, s.v.).

The adversative value carried by *iar* rests upon the denial of an expectation in which the predicates applied to the arguments are semantically identical while their referents are non coreferential.

1. Pragma-semantic models: expectation, implicature.

According to Robert Martin's pragma-semantic model, *expectation* is a way of representing a 'possible world', i.e. the world that has the best chances of realization as predicted by the speaker's universe of beliefs. But Robert Martin goes further than Leech by distinguishing between the semantic and pragmatic

* University of California at Davis, USA.

„Philologica Jassyensia", An X, Nr. 1 (19), 2014, p. 97–104.

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)

dimensions of expectations. Such a distinction made possible the integration of expectation into the semantic component of the information conveyed by an utterance even at a time when pragmatics was considered as a rather non-scientific component of linguistics:

> En tant que mécanismes, présuppositions et attentes font partie de la sémantique; en tant que contenus, ils relèvent de la pragmatique ['As mechanisms, presuppositions and expectations belong to semantics; as to their content, they belong to pragmatics'] (Martin 1983: 233).

and, later on:

> […] la «pragmatique» de la phrase n'est rien d'autre que la prévision de l'énoncé comme acte. Elle est intégrée comme une composante essentielle à la théorie sémantique elle-même ['The pragmatics of the phrase is nothing other than the prediction of the utterance as speech act. It is integrated as an essential component into the semantic theory itself'].
>
> Ainsi pour la pragmatique de l'interprétation, certes l'explication des présupposés ou des 'attentes' se fait selon des règles prévisibles ['As for the pragmatics of the interpretation, certainly, the explanation of either presuppositions or expectations is subject to predictable rules'] (*ibidem*: 235).

Robert Martin's model is in agreement with Levinson (1983)'s, which makes the distinction between *conversational* and *conventional implicatures* and it is a precursor of Vanderveke (1990), which offers a formal description of speech Acts[1].

As a matter of fact, an assertion confirming an unexpected event carries a conventional implicature that denies a certain expectation. According to Levinson,

> Conventional implicatures are non-truth-conditional inferences that are not derived from superordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims, but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions. They are not cancellable because they do not rely on defeasible assumptions about the nature of the context; they will not be detachable, because they depend on the particular linguistic term used; they will not be calculated using pragmatic principles and contextual knowledge, but rather given by convention; they may be expected to have a relatively determinate content or meaning; and therefore will be no expectation of a universal tendency for languages to associate the same conventional implicatures with expressions with certain truth conditions (Levinson 1983: 127–128)[2].

The integration of expectations and conventional implicatures into the semantic component of a linguistic model results in a more unified description capable of accounting for the constraints governing the use of adversative conjunctions in general, and the corresponding Romanian forms, in particular. As I hope to have demonstrated in an anterior paper (see Manoliu-Manea 2013), adversative conjunctions correspond to the logical operator *et*. They serve to express

[1] For a formal description of speech acts see especially chapter 4. *On the logical form of illocutionary acts*, p. 103–136.

[2] In Levinson (1983: 129), the adversative conjunction *but* constitutes a typical example of a lexical item carrying a conventional implicature. For the concepts of 'conversational and conventional implicature' see more recently, the survey of various positions concerning Grice's 'Principle of Cooperation' in Jaszczolt 2002: 207–223.

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)

an illocutionary speech act of confirmation by denying a certain expectation. However they differ in the way they impose certain constraints on their expectations, as well as to the result of their denial in the assertion. *Dar* denies an expectation stating that both arguments share predicates which bear the same sign, either positive or negative in each of the conjoined expressions, while its assertion changes the signs of one of the predicates: either (a) ((p . q) and asserts (p . ~q) or (b) (~p . ~q) and asserts: (~p . q). It may contain either semantically identical or different predicates.

(1) A: – Am auzit că Ana cântă şi dansează în acest spectacol ['I heard that Ann sings and dances in this show'].
B: – Ana cântă, e adevărat, *dar* nu dansează ['Ann sings, it is true, *but* she does not dance'].

(i) Expectation: $(V1x \wedge V2y)\ (x = y).\ (V1 \neq V2)$
Implicature: $\sim (V1x \wedge V2y)$
Assertion: $(V1x \wedge \sim V2y)\ (x = y).\ (V1 \neq V2)$,

where V1= 'sings', V2 = 'dances', x = Ana. Or:

(2) A: – Am auzit că Petru şi Ana vor cânta în acest spectatcol ['I heard that Peter and Ann will sing in this show'].
B: – Petru va cânta, e adevărat, *dar* Ana va dansa [nu va cânta] ['Peter will sing, it is true, *but* Ann will dance [will not sing]']

(ii) Expectation: $(V1x \wedge V2y)\ (y \neq x).\ (V1 = V2)$
Implicature: $\sim (V1x \wedge V2y)$
Assertion: $(V1x \wedge \sim V2y) \wedge V3\ (y \neq x)\ (V1 = V2)$,

where V1 and V2: 'sing' and V3 = 'dance', x = Petru and y = Ana.

Iar requires that the arguments are not coreferential: $(x \neq y)$. Its adversative value rests upon the denial of an expectation in which the second predicate is semantically identical to the previous one. Its adversative value may signal just that a new event is to follow. It has no real English correspondent. It may be translated by *whereas*, *whilst*, *while* or by *and*, but then it loses its pragmatic function of denial. Unlike *while*, *iar* may not connect semantically different predicates applied to coreferential arguments.

(3) Petru cânta *iar* Ana dansa ['Peter was singing whereas/ *whilst* Ann was dancing'].

In (3) *iar* serves to deny the expectation that V2 and V1 are identical:

(iii) Expectation: $(V1x \wedge V2y)\ (V2 = V1)\ (x \neq y)$
Implicature: $\sim (V2 = V1)$
Assertion: $(V1x \wedge V2y)\ (V2 \neq V1)\ (x \neq y)$,

where V1 = 'sing', V2 = 'dance', x = 'Peter', y = 'Ann'.

2. Old Romanian *iară*

Old Romanian texts present two variants: the variant *iară*, which, like in Greek and South-Danubian Romanian dialects, has a final vowel. As such, it is

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)

attested from the oldest Romanian texts (16–17th cs.) with two readings: (i) as an adverb denying an expected non-identity between the event described by the predicate determined by *iar* and previous events present in the speakers' memory (cf. Engl. 'again'), and (ii) as a conjunction, as a conjunction, denying the expectation that the predicate of the second sentence is semantically identical with the predicate of the previous sentence. In other words, the proper meaning of the adverb ('repeated event'), became the denied expectation by the conjunction. These semantic differences are reflected in their distribution:

(i) The adverb occurs as a sentence constituent of VP (see examples 4 and 5):

(4) Şi încă *iară* grăiaşte Davidŭ [lit. 'And *again* David says'] (Coresi 1914: 4) (16th c.).

(5) Mihai vodă după războiul ce-l pierduse la Teleajen, strîngea *iară* oastea pen munţi ['King Michael, after he lost the battle at Teleajen, was *again* gathering the army in the mountains'] (Costin 1967: 81) (17th c.).

(ii) The conjunction occurs between two sentences (either with a full VP or with an elliptical copula) (see 6):

(6) Cumŭ şi Hristosŭ întru pilda evangheliei au grăitŭ de cela ce semănă, de-i căzù sămânţa pre piatră, altuia în mărăcini, şi rodŭ nu făcură, *iară* aceluia ce căzù pre pământŭ bunŭ, multŭ rodŭ făcù ['As Christ has said in one of his parables about the sower who went out to sow, and some seeds fell on rocky soil, others fell among thorns, and they did not yield fruit, *whereas* other seeds fell on fertile soil and bore rich crop'] (Coresi 1914: 3).

The conjunction *iară* is often used just as a discourse marker of narrative continuity when a new event is added to the previous one (see 7)[3]:

(7) *Iară* după ce amŭ oblicitŭ, *iară* eu foarte m'amŭ bucuratŭ. Şi cu multă rugăciune cerşutu-amŭ de la Sfinţiia lui, şi mi-o au tremisŭ. *Iară* eu, deaca o văzuiu ce învăţătură dumnezeiască şi cu folosŭ sufletului şi trupului iaste întru ea, *iară* inima mea se îndulci ['[Iar] after I found it, [iar] I was very glad. And with a lot of prayer I asked for it to His Holiness, and he sent it to me, [iar], as for me, when I saw that it has so much of a wholly teaching and help for the soul and body, [iar] my heart was full of joy'] (Coresi 1914: 5–6).

In some cases *iară* is synonymous with *dar* (see 8, 9):

(8) Că ne-amŭ nevoitŭ ş'amŭ truditŭ, *iară* mintea noastră şi firea doară nu se-au de toate domiritŭ ['(Be)cause we worked hard, *but* our mind and soul could not really understand everything'] (Coresi 1914: 6).

(9) Răspunse duhulu hicleanu şi dzise: 'Isusu-l cunoscu şi Pavel ştiu, *iară* voi cinre seţi?' ['He answered to the sly ghost and said: "Jesus, I am acquainted with him and Paul I know him, *but* you, who are you?" '] (CV: 233)

(10) Cerul şi pământul se va schimba, *iară* cuvântul meu nu va trece în veacu (C Sturdz: 237) ['The sky and the earth will change but my word will never disappear'].

[3] Its function as a discourse marker is also mentioned in Tiktin &Miron (2001), according to which *iar* may mark the passage to another event, like Slavic *a* preceding *i* or *no*.

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)

For example, (10) has the following pragmatic information, which corresponds to the formula (i), carried by *dar*:

implicature: ~ ((V1x,y) ∧ (V2z))
assertion: (V1x,y) ∧ (~V2z), où (z ≠ x, y)

By the end of the 17th c., *iară* lost its final vowel.

In Neculce, for example both variants are present but *iar* has a very low frequency while *iară* is the preferred variant either as an adverb or a conjunction:

(11) Atuncea i-au întrebat vezirul pre boieri pentru Grigorii-vodă unde să află şi, de i-ar scrie, oari n-ari vini? *Iară* boierii munteneşti îl suduia şi dzicea că este om rău şi nici a mai vini de unde este dus. Dzisu-le-au atuncea veziriul: "Alegeţi-vă dară un domnu dintre voi, pe cine v-a plăcea, şi viniţi mîini dimineaţă să vi-l fac". *Iar* Grigorii-vodă de după perdeaoa veziriului asculta toate ['The Vezir then asked the boyars about Grigorii-Prince where he is and whether if they wrote to him, would he come? *And* the boyars from Muntenia said that he is a bad guy and he would not come back. The Vezir then said: "Elect them as a king from among yourselves and tomorrow morning I shall make him [king]. *And* Grigorii – voiveod, hidden by a curtain, was listening to everything'] (Neculce 1982: 39)

(12) La capul cel dintîi al Facerii spune Moysi cum că Dumnezeu a făcut doi luminători mari: unul mai mare şi altul mai mic; şi pre cel mal mare, adecă pre soare, întru stăpînirea zilii, *iar* pre cel mai mic, adecă pre lună, întru stăpînirea nopţii ['In the first chapter of the Genesis, Moses says that God has made two great enlighteners: one bigger that is the sun, to bring light to the day, *whereas* the other smaller, that is the moon, to bring light to the night'] (Ivireanul 1962: 126).

3. *Iarăşi*

As early as the 16th c., the adverb has a variant *iarăş(i)*:

(13) Că şi în cealea mai realele schimbându-mă, *iarăşi* mă mărescŭ în deşertŭ. Şi grăindŭ, încă mă mărescŭ, şi tăcându, *iarăşi* mă mărescŭ ['(Be)cause when changing my wrong ways, I praise myself *again* in vain. And speaking, [about it] I also praise myself, and shutting up, I praise myself *again*'] (Coresi 1914: 14).

(14) Decii Dabije-vodă s-au întorsu şi s-au aşezat lucrul despre veziriul şi *iarăş* au vinit domnu în Moldova ['So Dabija-king went back [to Istanbul] and got the approval of the Vizier, and became *again* the King of Moldova'] (Neculce 1982: 38) (18th c.).

The enclitic *-şi* (< Lat. *sibi* 'self') has been very productive in Old Romanian. It has been added to pronouns in order to express coreferentiality, usually denying an unexpected non-coreferentiality:

(15) elu*şi* 'he himself' vs. *el* 'he',
însu*şi* 'he himself' vs. old Rom. *însu* 'he' (Cf. Lat. *ipse*).

Added to the demonstrative pronoun of distance, it served to the formation of the emphatic pronoun: Compare: *acelaşi* 'the same' vs. *acela* 'that [one]'. The opposition between 'same' and 'self' is expressed even in contemporary Romanian by the forms ending in *-şi*:

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)

(16) ‘same’:

acela*şi*,	aceea*şi*,	aceia*şi*,	aceleaşi
same: MASC/SG	same: FEM/SG	same: MASC/PL	same: FEM/PL

(17) ‘self’:

însu*şi*,	însă*şi*,	înşi*şi*,	*însele* ‘self’
self: MASC/SG	self: FEM/SG	self: MASC/PL	self: FEM/PL

See also the indefinite pronoun for persons:

(18) urul cinrescu*şi* de voi [‘one whoever of you’] (CV: 250)

When added to adverbs it suggests a quasi-identity between the time of speaking and the time of the event:

(19) *acuşi*, *acuşi* ‘right now’ vs. *acu*(*m*) ‘now’,
acieşi ‘right away’ vs. *aci* (*aici*) ‘here’, etc.

(20) Şi *acieşi* închiseră uşile cerîndu elu se-lu ucigă [‘And they closed the doors right away while asking them to kill him’] (CV: 261).

In standard contemporary Romanian, the conjunction continues the short variant *iar* (*iară*), whereas the adverb oscillates between *iar*, and the compound *iarăşi*. For example, in Creangă (*Amintiri*), the variant *iar* is more frequent than *iară* as a conjunction:

(21) Bădiţa Vasile a zâmbit atunci, *iar* noi şcolarii am rămas cu ochii holbaţi [‘Mr. Vasile then smiled, whereas we the students were staring with wide-opened eyes’] (Creangă 1953: 18).

(22) Flăcăii ceilalţi pe dată s'au facut nevăzuţi *iară* noi copiii ne-am întors plângând pe la casele noastre [‘The other boys disappeared instantly, whereas we, the children, went back to our homes wiping’] (Creangă 1953: 20–21).

More recently, the variant *iar* is used as a conjunction, while *iarăşi* is the preferred adverbial variant:

(23) Nimic nu era necriticat, nebârfit, necomentat, *iar* imitaţia se practica pe scară largă [‘Nothing was left without being criticized, maligned, slandered, whilst the imitation was used on a large scale’] (Buzura 1993: XI).

(24) M-am interesat *iarăşi*, cu încăpăţânare, de lumea celor de “care nu ne putem lipsi” [‘Stubbornly, I took again an interest in the world of those “we can not live without”’] (Buzura 1993: IX).

In a sample of the site presenting articles from various contemporary newspapers (October, 2013), only the variant *iar* is present either as an adverb or a conjunction:

(25) A fugit *iar* şi l-am urmărit până la St George’s Road. Mi-a dat telefonul atunci [‘He ran *again* and I followed him up to St George’s Road. Then he gave me the phone’] (ziare.com: 10, 14, 2013).

(26) Acesta este urmat de Ferdinand I (72,3%), regele Marii Uniri din anul 1918, *iar* cel mai puţin important personaj dintre regii incluşi în sondaj este Carol al II-lea (66,3%) [‘This one is followed by Ferdinand I (72.3%), the king of the Great Unification, *whilst* the less important person among the kings included in the survey is Carol II (66.3%)’] (ziare.com. 10, 15, 2013).

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)

Conclusions

The evolution of Romanian *iar* 'again' or 'whereas' constitutes an interesting case of split grammaticalization, where a pragmatic information of the adverbial variant ('denial of an expected non-identity between the event described by the predicate determined by *iar* and previous events present in the speakers' memory) becomes the proper meaning of the other variant, the conjunction (i.e. 'the predicate of the second sentence is semantically different than the predicate of the previous sentence').

Corpora

Buzura 1993: Augustin Buzura, *Vocile nopţii*, Bucureşti: Minerva.

C Sturdz: *Codex Sturdzanus*, studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic, ediţie de text şi indice de cuvinte de Gheorghe Chivu, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 1993.

Coresi 1914: Diaconul Coresi, *Carte cu învăţătură* [1581], publicată de Sextil Puşcariu şi Alexie Procopovici, 1. *Textul*, Bucureşti: Socec and Co.

Creangă 1953: Ion Creangă, *Opere*, ediţie îngrijită, prefaţă şi glosar de acad. prof. G. Călinescu, [Clasicii români] Bucureşti: Editura de stat pentru literatură şi artă.

Costin 1967: Miron Costin, *Opere alese. Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei. De neamul Moldovenilor, Viaţa lumii* [1633–1691], Texte stabilite, studiu introductiv, note şi glosar de Liviu Onu, Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică,.

CV: *Codicele Voroneţean* [15th c.–16th c], ediţie critică, studiu filologic şi studiu lingvistic de Mariana Constantinescu, Bucureşti: Minerva, 1981.

Ivireanul 1962: Antim Ivireanul, *Predici*, ediţie critică, studiu introductiv şi glosar de G. Ştrempel, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei.

Neculce 1982: Ion Neculce, *Opere. Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei. O samă de cuvinte* [18th c.], ediţie îngrijită şi studiu introductiv de G. Ştrempel, Bucureşti: Minerva.

References

Ciorănescu 2001: Alexandru Ciorănescu, *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române*, ediţie îngrijită şi traducere din limba spaniolă de Tudora Şandru Mehedinţi şi Magdalena Popescu Marin, Bucureşti: Editura SAECULUM I. O.

Jaszczolt 2002: Katarzyna M. Jaszczolt, *Semantics and Pragmatics. Meaning in Language and Discourse*, London : Pearson Education/Longman.

Levinson 1983: St.C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*, Cambridge/ London/ New York/ Melbourne/ Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Manoliu-Manea 2013: Maria Manoliu-Manea, 'I don't hate you, I love you.' Adversative conjunctions in a Rumanian–English Contrastive Grammar', in: Dumitru Chiţoran (ed), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Contrastive Grammars*, Bucharest: The University of Bucharest Press, pp. 159–168.

Martin 1983: Robert Martin, *Pour une logique du sens*. Paris: PUF

Meyer-Lübke 1968: Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke: *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Meyer-Lübke 1972: Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatick der romanischen Sprachen*, Hildescheim, New York: G. Olms (1890–1902[1st]).

Puşcariu 1975: Sextil Puşcariu, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache: lateinisches Element Berücksichtigung aller romanischen Sprachen*, Heidelberg: Winter (1905[1st]).

Tiktin & Miron 2001: Hariton Tiktin & Paul Miron, *Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch / H. Tiktin*, Bd. 1, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)

Abstract

Of a controversial origin, IAR is attested from the oldest Romanian texts with two functions: (i) as an adverb meaning ‘repeated event’, cf. Engl. ‘again’, which denies the expectation that the predicate determined by the adverb is not identical with previous events present in the speakers’ memory, and (ii) as a conjunction, denying the expectation that the predicate of the second sentence is semantically identical with the predicate of the previous sentence. This evolution shows once again the fact that some language changes can be accounted for only by including pragmatic dimensions such as expectation and implicature in the description of the conveyed information.

BDD-A6644 © 2014 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-11-01 04:02:05 UTC)