

ADRIAN CHIRCU

**TRACES OF SERBIAN-ROMANIAN LINGUISTIC
CONTACT IN MORPHOSYNTAX.
THE INDEFINITE PARTICLE -GODE IN THE BANAT
SUBDIALECT OF THE ROMANIAN LANGUAGE***

*To my grammar teacher G.G. Neamțu,
on his happy anniversary*

1. PRELIMINARIES

The aim of our study is to discuss a set of Romanian indefinite pronouns and adverbs formed using the particle -GODE, created as a result of direct linguistic contact between Romanian and Serbian speakers in the southwestern part of the Romanian linguistic territory (specifically in the Banat subdialect).

2. LANGUAGES IN CONTACT

2.1. Thus, we are confronted with a clear example of interference, which can be explained by the fact that “in speech, interference is like sand carried by a stream; in language, it is the sedimented sand deposited on the bottom of a lake. The two phases of interference should be distinguished. In speech, it occurs anew in the utterances of the bilingual speaker as a result of his personal knowledge of the other tongue. In language, we find interference phenomena which, having frequently occurred in the speech of bilinguals, have become habitualised and established. Their use is no longer dependent on bilingualism. When a speaker of language X uses a form of foreign origin not as an on-the-spot borrowing from language Y, but because he has heard it used by others in X-utterances, then his borrowed element can be considered, from the descriptive viewpoint, to have become a part of language” (Weinrich 1979, p. 11).

2.2. In the realm of (socio)linguistics, apart from the initial guiding definition related to phases of linguistic contact, numerous diverse viewpoints have been expressed, which vary in significance and purpose.

* An initial version of this paper was presented at the workshop *Written language contact vs direct language contact as a source for grammatical change*, Bucharest, “Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Romanian Academy, 27 October 2023.

As a general rule, these perspectives address common issues (sociolinguistic-bilingualism), or different levels of language (lexicon- in particular, phonetic, grammatical), the primary objective being the precise delineation of specific features (whether evolutionary or not) found in world languages and attributed to external influences.

2.3. In general, there are two types of influences: one explicable by “dominance” and the other by direct contact (unmediated contact), involving successive phases of bilingualism or interference. These influences (whether intentional or unintentional, directional or not) are closely tied to the need for effective communication in various situations.

In this regard, we have considered the definitions provided by three linguistic schools: the American school, the French school, and the Romanian school, with particular interest in the latter.

Uriel Weinrich claims that

“two or more languages will be said to be IN CONTACT if they are used alternately by the same persons. The language-using individuals are thus the locus of the contact. The practice of alternately using two languages will be called BILINGUALISM, and the persons involved, BILINGUAL. Those instances of derivation for the norms of either-language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e., as a result of language contact, will be referred to as INTERFERENCE phenomena. It is these phenomena of speech, and their impact on the norms of either language exposed to contact, that invite the interest of the linguist” (Weinrich 1979, p. 1).

2.4. Regarding the domain of the French language, Louis-Jean Calvet argues that, before discussing languages in contact, we must consider plurilingualism, as it “keeps languages in continuous contact. The site of these contacts can be the individual (bilingual or in an acquisition situation) or the community. And the result of these contacts is one of the primary objects of study in sociolinguistics” (Calvet 1998, p. 23)¹.

2.5. As for the Romanian perspective, Marius Sala affirms that

“contact between languages has existed since ancient times; different human communities have interacted at various historical stages, and this phenomenon has played a significant role in linguistic evolution [...]. It is a phenomenon found in all regions of the world as the existence of a completely isolated language, without contact with neighbouring languages, has never been observed. The interpenetration of languages can be observed wherever different languages coexist, either on the same territory or in neighbouring territories, as bilingualism is a phenomenon that affects the majority of the global population [...]. Linguistic contact between languages is most evident in border regions, manifesting itself either between languages of different origins (the Balkan Peninsula) or between languages from the same family

¹ All translations of quotes and examples in English language from this study belong to us. We offer also the original text: “fait que les langues sont constamment en contact. Le lieu de ces contacts peut être l’individu (bilingue, ou en situation d’acquisition) ou la communauté. Et le résultat de ces contacts est l’un des premiers objets d’étude de la sociolinguistique” (Calvet 1998, p. 23).

(Romance languages). Even though the result of this contact is stronger (Istro-Romanian language in the Balkan Peninsula), it does not lead to mixed languages²” (Sala 1997, p. 9–10)³.

3. THE INFLUENCE OF SERBIAN ON ROMANIAN

3.1. In the situations described above, we also find the Romanian language, which has experienced a wide range of external influences (Slavic, Turkish, Neo-Greek, Hungarian, German, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Serbian), not to mention those only with direct and/or neighbouring contact, even though there are other observable influences present in Romanian (Neo-Latin, French, Italian, English, Russian).

Among these, the Serbian influence stands out, which has exerted a strong impact on the Banat subdialect (especially in the southwest) and on the Romanian dialects spoken south of the Danube, with lexical infiltrations also observed in other subdialects (southern Crișana and western Muntenia – Oltenia). Slavic-Romanian language contact “spread around fifteen hundred years ago when significant Slavic populations moved south and southwest into territories where a Romance or Romanized population predominated, speaking the Latin language” (Gămulescu 1983, p. 5)⁴.

We know that

“from a demographic perspective, in Banat – due to the successive regimes it underwent – various influences can be observed. Therefore, the Serbian element infiltrates the southwestern Banat in five successive waves, starting from the end of the 14th century until the end of the 15th century, as a result of the Turkish conquest of Serbia” (TDR 1984, p. 242)⁵.

² See also the analysis of the definition of linguistic contact carried out by Ungureanu (2017, p. 56).

³ “contactul dintre limbi există din cele mai vechi timpuri; diferitele colectivități umane au intrat în relație unele cu altele în diverse etape istorice, astfel că acest fenomen a jucat un rol important în evoluția lingvistică [...]. Este un fenomen care se regăsește în toate regiunile globului, căci nicăieri nu s-a putut constata existența unei limbi complet izolate, fără contact cu limbile vecine. Interpenetrarea limbilor poate fi observată peste tot unde coexistă limbi diferite, pe același teritoriu sau pe teritorii învecinate, pentru că bilingvismul este un fenomen care atinge majoritatea populației globului [...]. Contactul lingvistic dintre limbi este mai evident în regiunile de graniță, manifestându-se fie între limbi, de obicei, diferite ca origine (Peninsula Balcanică), fie că este între limbi din aceeași familie (limbile române). Chiar dacă rezultatul acestui contact este mai puternic (istroromâna din Peninsula Balcanică), nu se ajunge la limbi mixte” (Sala 1997, p. 9–10).

⁴ “își au începutul în urmă cu circa o mie cinci sute de ani, când importante mase de slavi s-au deplasat înspre sud și sud-vest, în teritorii în care predomina o populație romanică sau romanizată, vorbitoare a limbii latine” (Gămulescu 1983, p. 5).

⁵ “din punct de vedere demografic, în Banat – datorită stăpânirilor succesive la care a fost supus – se constată diferite influențe. Astfel, elementul sârbesc pătrunde în sud-vestul Banatului, în cinci valuri succesive, începând cu sfârșitul secolului al XIV-lea și până la sfârșitul secolului al XV-lea, ca urmare a cuceririi Serbiei de către turci” (TDR 1984, p. 242).

3.2. Throughout history, numerous studies of varying purpose and significance have been conducted, the authors of which referred to the Serbian-(Croatian)-Romanian linguistic contact as being one of the most intense. Information regarding this influence can be found in the research of linguists such as: Rosetti (1954); Mihăilă (1960); Trâpcea (1963, 1964); Flora (1968); Gămulescu (1974, 1983); TDR (1983); Frăţilă (1993, p. 19–80); Mării (2005); Evseev (2009); Popović (2009, 2010); Sicoe (2017, 2022); Micle (2018, p. 122–131); GRBS (2022, p. 25–38), etc.

Romanian has also influenced the Serbian language, as evidenced by the numerous language features identified in the language (Gămulescu 1983).

4. THE PARTICLE -GODE IN SERBIAN

4.1. Unfortunately, time does not allow us to delve into the complexity of the Serbian language's influence on Romanian, which is observable in all linguistic aspects. Instead, we will focus on the aspect mentioned in the title, namely, the morphosyntactic behaviour of the indefinite particle -GODE. The issue of indefinite particles has been extensively discussed in works of general grammar.

For example, Haspelmath discusses the constructions that have led to the formation of indefinite markers ("Indefiniteness Marking") and he connects them to so-called grammaticalization, stating that the languages of the world show several types of markers (*The 'dunno' type*, *The 'want/please' type*, *The 'it may be' type*, *The 'no matter' type*), with the Romanian language being characterized as the 'want' type.

4.2. As a matter of fact, in the 'want' type: "the original meaning is that of free choice. While the source construction in the 'want' type explicitly leaves the choice to the hearer, the same effect is achieved more indirectly by the concessive conditional source. Concessive conditional expresses a conditional relationship between a consequent and a series of antecedent conditions" (Haspelmath 2004, p. 139).

4.3. We also mention the fact that, in Serbian, the indefinite particle -GODE has two forms: a standard one, *god*, and a dialectal one, *gode*, which appears in the structure of some compounds: *ko god* 'everybody, anyone, anybody/whichever', *koji god* 'whichever', *što god* 'every/each, anything, all/everything', *kakav god* 'of any sort, anyhow/however', *kad god* 'whenever', *koliko god* 'however' (DSR, s.v.), *gde god*, *gdje god* 'wherever', *sta god* 'whatever', *dokle god* 'while' (RES, s.v.).

4.4. Interestingly, in the Romani language (Bulgarian varieties), there is an almost identical construction *kaj-godi* 'anywhere' (Haspelmath 2004, p. 185) – which, although similar to the one found in Romanian, seems to be rather a borrowing from Bulgarian; cf. *koi-godě* 'anyone, anybody/whichever, whoever', DLR, s.v.).

5. INDEFINITE MARKERS IN ROMANIAN

5.1. Therefore, like other pronouns in other languages, Romanian indefinite pronouns would be part of the ‘want’ group, represented by the particle OR (Haspelmath 2004, p. 164–166), but no specific “direct borrowing” is assigned to the Romanian language, a statement which needs to be reconsidered.

5.1.1. Haspelmath affirms that “although indefinite pronouns are part of grammatical system and grammatical markers are relatively resistant to borrowings, a surprisingly large number of cases have been attested where an indefiniteness marker was taken over from another language, either by direct borrowing or by calquing” (Haspelmath 2004, p. 164–166).

5.1.2. However, Romanian is among the languages that have a series of borrowed indefinite markers, such as *măcar* (< Gr. *μακάρι*), *acar* (< Hu. *akár*) and *gode* (< Sr. *god*, Sr. reg. *gode*), encountered in phrases such as Ro. *măcar cum* ‘anyhow/however’, Ro. *acar unde* ‘anywhere/wherever’, Ro. *cândgode* ‘at any time/whenever’.

5.2. In Romanian diachronic studies (Densusianu 1997, p. 538–542; GLRV 2009, p. 69–73; Stan 2013, p. 53–55; SOR 2016, p. 353–354; ILR 2018, p. 634–635; SLRV 2019, p. 324–326; OHRM 2021, p. 191–197), the use of such particles is often discussed.

In the pages of OHRM, there are detailed discussions regarding the presence of indefinite markers in the Romanian language, with a focus on their evolution (“Compound with interrogative-relative elements”). Most of them can be classified under *The ‘want’ type*, which “is the richest, with parallel prefixed (*oare/-vare-*, *ori-/veri-*) and suffixed (*-va*) series” (*va* < *vare* < *voare* < lat. *VOLET*; *veri* < lat. *VELIS*), but also under *The ‘it may be’ type*, “illustrated by the prefixation of *fie-* (the third-person present subjunctive of *a fi* ‘to be’)” (OHRM 2021, p. 191): *fie* < lat. *FIAT*.

5.3. In Romanian, the indefinite forms have a WH-particle (*oricare* ‘anyone, anybody/whichever’, *oarecare* ‘some, somebody’, *orice* ‘anything/whatever’, *oriunde* ‘anywhere/wherever’, *oricum* ‘anyhow, anyway/however’, *cineva* ‘somebody, someone’, *ceva* ‘something, anything’, *cumva* ‘somehow’, *undeva* ‘somewhere’, etc.). Some of these particles could be dislocated in the older stages of language (*oare drept ce lucru* ‘for some reason [= for a reason whatever]’; GLRV 2009, p. 72).

5.4. In a similar context, we find the particle *GODE* in the Banat idioms, as a Serbian borrowing. In Serbian, the *GODE* particle is widely used, as suggested by lexicographic works. It is evident that in Romanian, *gode* (*gude*, *god*, *gud*) has been borrowed from Serbian through a partial (structural) calque (Mării 2005, p. 95), with the indefinite marker in postposition. This is in opposition to the other indefinite formants, which are (*-va* excepted) proclitic.

5.5. The Serbian particle *gode* seems to have been borrowed by Romanian with an adapted form in the Banat dialect (i.e. *gode* > *gode*), a phonetic alteration evidenced in a series of papers. In DLR, the form *gode* is recorded as being

“a particle which is combined with the pronoun in order to give it an indefinite meaning, as *ori-*, *oare-*, *acar-*, *-va*” (DLR, s.v.)⁶.

6. THE INDEFINITE PARTICLE *-GODE* IN ROMANIAN

6.1. Therefore, in the main study which explores the Serbian-Romanian contact, it is specified that GOD(E) is a particle which attaches to pronouns and adverbs in order to express an indefinite sense, and the following dialectal pronominal and adverbial forms are given (in Banat *d + e*, *i > đ*: *únde* ‘where’, *de* ‘of, from’, *des* ‘often’, *dedet* ‘finger’ – TDR 1984, p. 250): simple form (rarely): *gođe* (NCB, p. 11) and compound (often): *Unde gođe* *le* *mă duc, tot cu tine mă întâlnesc*. ‘Wherever I go, I always come across you’ (CGB II, p. 101), *cum-gođe* ‘somehow, somewhat’: *roșu ca un cumgođe călmăjănu* ‘red somehow like a broadcloth’ (ALR. *Serie nouă*, IV, map 1215/point 36), *alb ca cumgođe lapčil’i* ‘as white as the milk might be’ (ALR. *Serie nouă*, IV, map 1213/point 36), *cum-góde* ‘by all means, at any price’ (Dens. TH 315); cf. scr. *kako god* ‘anyhow, anyway/however, whatever’, *kakogod* ‘somehow, somewhat’ (RJA IV 758); *ce-gode* ‘anything/whatever’ (DA II 280); *ši-gode* (*ši* = standard *ce* ‘what’) ‘anything/whatever’ (ALR. *Serie nouă*, V, map 1358/point 29: *am dă toci ši-godī-m trebe* ‘I have anything I need of everything’); *cine-gode* ‘anyone, anybody/whoever’ (Costin. Mărg. 45: *La cine gođe ochii i-a arunca, / Pe toți i-a îmbăta*. ‘Whomsoever he would watch, / One by one would be entranced.’), *Că-i bun român și-i învățat / Nu-i ori ca ši-ne-gode*. [an over-marked structure, both by *ori* – proclitic and dislocated – and by enclitic *gode*] ‘He is a good Romanian and learned too / Not like some or other fellow’ (CGB I, p. 113); cf. scr. *šta god* ‘anyone’, *koi god* ‘anyone, anybody/whichever; anything/whatever’ (Stevanović 439)⁷.

6.2. Ion Mării affirms that the definition in DLR (s.v.) is not complete because this indefinite particle also combines with adverbs, just as it occurs in Serbian (Mării 2005, p. 94). Therefore, in Romanian, we have *cum-gođe* ‘anyhow, anyway/however’, *cât-gođe* ‘however, anything, whatever’, *unde-gúde* ‘anywhere/ wherever’⁸, and these forms can also be found in the Toager dialect (*cum-góde vrei tu* ‘howsoever you may like it’, *cât-góde ceri tu, îți dau* ‘anything you ask, I’ll give it to you.’, *unde-góde vrei tu, merg* ‘wherever you want to go, I will go with you/Anywhere you may want me go to, I will’ – Mării 2005, p. 95).

6.3. The adverbial compounds with *gode* are also discussed by the authors of GRBS (2022), who, after a series of investigations conducted in the Serbian Banat (2007–2009), observed that there are both pronouns (*cinegode* ‘anyone’, *cinevagode* ‘someone’ (another overmarking, both by *-va* and then by *-gode*), *cegode*

⁶ “o particulă care se compune cu pronumele spre a-i da un înțeles nedefinit, ca *ori-*, *oare-*, *acar-*, *-va*” (DLR, s.v.).

⁷ In this paragraph, the examples are mainly excerpted from Gămulescu’s study (1974, p. 136–137).

⁸ Examples excerpted by Mării (2005, p. 95) from PFRS (p. 379–384).

‘something’ – GRBS 2022, p. 138) and adverbs (*cândgode* ‘sometime’, *cumgode* ‘somehow’, *undegode* ‘somewhere’ – GRBS 2022, p. 151) formed with this indefinite particle, whose meaning is similar to Ro. *-va* (*-gode* = *-va*: *cinegode* = *cineva* ‘someone’, *cegode* = *ceva* ‘something’, *cândgode* = *cândva* ‘sometime’, etc.), representing a characteristic feature specific to the Banat region:

- (1) **cinegode** ne-o spus, acumă nu ştiu cine (GRBS, Ms VIIIb)
‘someone told us, now I no longer remember who’
- (2) Aşa io nu pot s-o omor că-i a mea [fata], **ségode** o făcut, nu pot. (GRBS, M VIIc)
‘Now, I can’t kill her, she is mine, whatever she may have done, I can’t’.

6.4. A varied usage of *gode* and its variants are to be found on some dialectal maps, which often show an extension beyond the combining types mentioned by Gămulescu. It consists of occurrences that are no longer related to the presence of a pronoun/adverb; so to speak, *gode* becomes an independent word whose meaning seems to be an approximation (7–11). Thus, in NALR. *Banat*, I (map 153/point 90), *cum gode* ‘anyhow’, and in ALR. *GMDT*, IV, we find such combinations as:

- (3) *când god* (map 439/12) – pólog [se zice] **când god** camára astâns la un loc
‘It’s called a haystack whenever it’s stacked’
- (4) *cum god* (map 461/54) – **cum god** îi dîs ‘any way you may call it’
- (5) *cât gude* (map 515/35) – la tîot **cât gude** ai tu ‘to everything you have’
- (6) *toate gude* (map 530/33) – a rojît [perf. c. 3]; **tóce gude** ‘all of them seemed to swarm’
- (7) *ca god* (map 478/56) – e **ca god** l’încă ‘it looks like a lentil.’
- (8) *ca gode* (map 447/32) – **ca gode** aşca dă tãl’efóáne ‘as for instance those from the phone company’
- (9) *godea* (map 456/57) – am adunát **gode** zăjîră ‘I have gathered some cereals.’
- (10) *gud – până gud* (map 467/51) – până **gud** úmplu búru ‘till I manage to fill the barrel.’
- (11) *ce gude* (map 482/28) – **se gode** strâze ‘whatever he may put together’

6.5. The indefinite forms are attested in other works containing dialectal or folkloric materials: *cine gode* ‘anyone, anybody/whoever’ (12), *ce gode* ‘anything/whatever’ (spelling variant *ce gogie*; NCB, p. 11) (13), *cum gode* ‘like’/*cum god(ze)* ‘anyhow/however’ (14–15):

- (12) Cu **şîne god’e** s-o-ntâlîni / În toţ ínim-o plesîni. (ŞFR, p. 175)
‘Whomsoever he will meet / The heart will burst in every one of them’.
- (13) Numa la fişor nu duşe cârpe, numa şinstă: pită, mâncare, răkie, **şe-gode** trăbui. (FA, p. 57)
‘Only to the lad you needn’t give any rags, but merely gifts: bread, food, raki, and anything he may need’.
- (14) Ieş, mândro, pân la uliţă... / Să nu-ţ umblu p-îngă gard / **Cum god’** un câne turbat. (ATLPR, p. 94)
‘Come, wench, come out to the lane / Don’t let me go around the fence / As a mad dog should go around’.
- (15) Muiĉe, cum va veñi copilu-osta la cíne, tu să caţ să-l omori **cum-godze** şci. (PFRS, p. 354)
‘Woman, as soon as this child comes to you, try to kill him any way you may know’.

6.6. Similar indefinite pronouns and adverbs are registered in numerous dialectal glossaries:

- (16) *șinĕgode* ‘anybody/whoever’ (GRVST, p. 81)
- (17) *șĕgode* ‘anything/whatever’ (GRVST, p. 81)
- (18) *fiegogie* ‘a nobody, no one important’ – A (nu) fi **un fiegogie** (CTM, p. 194)
‘Don’t be a nobody (an unknown, a worthless person)’
- (19) *cegogie* ‘anything/whatever’ – îi fac’e rău **cegogie** mîncă (CTM, p. 194)
‘no matter what he eats, it upsets his stomach’
- (20) *cumgogie* ‘anyhow/however/no matter how’ – **cumgogie** fac, tot nu-m iese
bin’e (CTM, p. 194) ‘no matter what I do, it still doesn’t turn out right’
- (21) *caregogie* ‘anybody/whoever, whatever’ – îl ag’iut pră *car’egogie* în
c’er’e ag’iutor’i (CTM, p. 194–195) ‘I help anyone who asks for help.’
- (22) *c’in’egogie* ‘anybody/whoever’ – ia trăbă să șciie **cinĕgogie** vin’e la
min’e (CTM, p. 195) ‘She must know whoever comes to me’
- (23) *cândgogie* ‘whenever’ – **cângogie** pl’ec unĕieva, o găsăsc pră scamn la socac
(CTM, p. 195) ‘whenever I go somewhere, I find her sitting on a chair by the
roadside.’
- (24) *cumgoge* ‘anyhow/however [= carelessly]’ – Fă un lucru cum trăbuie, nu
cumgoge (MGG, p. 63) ‘Do a thing properly, not carelessly.’
- (25) *ungegoge* ‘wherever, anywhere’ – Așa șeva nu gășăsci **ungegoge** (MGG, p. 175)
‘You can’t find such a thing everywhere.’
- (26) *cumgoge* ‘anyhow/however/no matter how’ (TGR, p. 35)
- (27) *ungegoge* ‘wherever, anywhere’ – Asta nu-i **ungegoge**. (LGS, p. 71) ‘You won’t
find this just anywhere.’
- (28) *ungegoge* ‘wherever, anywhere’ – **Unde goge** ai fost? (LPSR, p. 365)
‘Where have you been?’
- (29) *cumgoge* ‘anyhow/however’ – Verde **cum goge** iarba (LPSR, p. 365)
‘Green like grass’

6.7. We have, in turn, conducted an investigation in the western part of Banat during the summer of 2021 (the project carried by Hummel *et alii* 2018–2022), to confirm the usage of the particle *gode* (using a questionnaire created for this purpose). On this occasion, we found that these forms are indeed present, but used only by the elderly members of village communities. Using what is called a “direct question” (i.e. one which contains the word which must be ascertained or explained), we received the following contexts (literalised):

- (30) **Unegode** ai pus lopata? ‘Where did you put the shovel?’
- (31) Mere **ungegode**. ‘He goes somewhere’
- (32) **Undegode** a umblat? ‘Where did he walk to?’
- (33) **Undegode** te duci? ‘Where are you going?’
- (34) **Undegode** ai pus flanela? ‘Where did you put the sweater?’

These examples of usage show an obvious loss of the original indefinite meaning; the compounded forms become mere interrogative adverbs, at least in the interrogative phrases.

6.8. Such examples can also be identified in the so-called writings in the Banat dialect⁹ (ALDB, PGB), which contain many specific dialectal elements:

- (35) Să n-o ploaie, să n-o ningă și bine să să scucească, / **Caregoge** mozomaină să nu o băzocurască. (ALDB, p. 166)
'Let her never be touched by rain nor snow, and be well sheltered / And never mocked by any monstrosity'
- (36) Mi-s un **caregoge** Chira, / Prăstă mine zburdă anii. (ALDB, p. 172)
'I am someone called Chira, / The years fly over me.'
- (37) s-or bărbărit **caregoge** fișori, unii dânr-ăi măi prăpăgiț dân sat. (ALDB, p. 282)
'some lads among the poorest devils in the village got into a fight.'
- (38) **Cumgoge** toce mă dor, mă nădăi că ar pringe bine. (ALDB, p. 290)
'somehow when everything me sick, I hope it is for my benefit.'
- (39) ś-am vădzut acoló – lume năcăjătă, nu **śegoge** (ALDB, p. 291)
'what I saw there – wretched people, not something irrelevant'
- (40) ba śică pră **caregoge** i-or și băgat acoló (ALDB, p. 297)
'what is more, it is said that some of them were put in there.'
- (41) Așa s-o-ńegurat ńńtr-o duminică la Valea Pai, ńńtr-alta la Izgar, o' că la Icloda, o' că pră **ungegoge**. (ALDB, p. 297)
'It got so dark on one Sunday at Valea Pai, on another at Izgar, or maybe at Icloda, or somewhere else.'
- (42) că măi bine să de grăgina la **caregoge** dă prń alce pńrț să pună grăgina (ALDB, p. 301)
'it is better to give the garden to someone from elsewhere for gardening'
- (43) Ś-apo' cucubețu-i harnic, nu **cumgoge**. (ALDB, p. 301)
'And then the bounder is diligent, not anyhow'
- (44) ca să nu ce dăsparț **cumgoge** dă pucerea sovietelor (ALDB, p. 308)
'in order not to part with the power of the Soviets in any way'
- (45) avere dńn popor pńńtru popor, nu **cumgoge**! (ALDB, p. 313)
'the wealth of the people, for the people, not in any way!'
- (46) Śi io tot cred c-o avut **caregoge** un viț prostesc. (ALDB, p. 352)
'And I still believe that someone had a foolish vice'
- (47) prăcum că să vńd dńcń măi sńre **caregoge** persoanń dń om (ALDB, p. 354)
'that it can be seen if a human person whatsoever still jumps'
- (48) Dar măi nńńnce sń-m aducń fieșcecure śercificace dń la doftor prăcum că śe-i **caregoge**. (ALDB, p. 360)
'But they all must bring me a doctor's certificate beforehand, proving that there is something.'
- (49) cńńd sń dușe cu șofeu sń spele chimeșńle, cń-i mamń dń anńzńnrń, nu **śegoge**... (ALDB, p. 411)
'when she went with the bucket to wash the shirts, because she was the mother of an engineer, not just anyone'
- (50) Sń nu vń punń nńpustu sń plecaț pră **ungegoge**... (ALDB, p. 441)
'You shall not be compelled by the dickens to go away somewhere'

⁹ See also Sicoe (2022, p. 120).

- (51) Cum i-ar vântura-ncontrova / Fiincă el nu-i **şinie goge!** (PGB I, p. 263)
 ‘How he would scatter them here and there and anywhere / As he is not just anyone!’
- (52) **Carie goge** în sat vinie / Îi primit cum să cuvinie. (PGB II, p. 149)
 ‘Anyone who comes to the village / Is welcomed as it becomes.’

6.9. Three forms remain nevertheless atypical. For example, *fiegode* ‘everyone’ (19) illustrates the contamination of indefinite markers, with both the old common Romanian formant *fie* and the recently borrowed dialectal *gode* combined in one pronominal form. The same indefinite overmarking can be seen in *cinevagoge* ‘anybody’ (GRBS 2022, p. 138) and *oricegóde* ‘anything’ (Trăpcea 1964, p. 269; Mării 2005, p. 95), where *gode* is attached to indefinite pronouns already formed with internal Romanian elements: it shows a tendency to use the borrowed *gode* as an invariant marker (i.e. its presence is felt as a typical necessary feature in indefinites, with no regard for the indefinite markers already present in the pronouns or adverbs).

6.10. Equally rare is the attachment of adverbial particles to *gode* when used independently, a feature often encountered in the Romanian language with adverbs (*gogilea* ‘wherever’, *gogilea* ‘anyhow, however’ – DVB, s.v.; PDB, p. 62, *godelui*¹⁰ ‘it’s like, like he’d’ (DLR, s.v.), and *godea* – ALR.GMDT, IV, map 456; cf. *pururea/pururilea* ‘eternally’, *aici/aci/acilea* ‘right here’), giving it functional autonomy in the system. Equally autonomous, with the meaning ‘somewhat, to some extent’, *góde* is used in some dialects:

- (53) tot ce-i **góde** drept acolo [la casă] am făcut eu cu ea [= soţia]. (GRBS 2022, p. 151, B VIIIc)
 ‘everything that is somewhat right there [= at the house], I did it with my wife’

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1. The linguistic data we have inventoried and described shows a strongly fixed Serbian feature at the morphological level of indefinite markers in the Banat area. The significant number of indefinites composed with *gode* is given by some recurrent forms, such as *cumgóde* ‘anyhow, however’, *cândgóde* ‘whenever’ and *undegode* ‘wherever’.

7.2. As such, we were able to describe a clear example of linguistic contact, with implications at a formational level, through the partial calque of the Serbian model. From a topical analysis, the pattern of those dialectal indefinites consists in attaching *-góde* as an enclitic formant – which, excepting the certainly most archaic forms with enclitic *-va*, is atypical in Romanian (where the proclisis of the indefinite markers is prevalent)¹¹.

¹⁰ It may be attached to a personal pronoun in the dative (**Godelui** i-ar fi mai bine. ‘Like he’d be better off’; DLR, s.v.).

¹¹ One of the authors of glossaries records an antecedent form: *gogie (şinie)* ‘anyone’ (BCVU, p. 39).

7.3. Such analyses help us to understand the effect and significance of linguistic contacts in the morphological field, where late borrowings are unusual enough. However, such “infiltrations” from the outside into the nature of languages are more likely to occur in territories characterised by interethnic contacts, which is the case of the Banat, especially in its Serbian part.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS. ACRONYMS

- ALDB = Ioan Viorel Boldureanu, Simion Dănilă, Cornel Ungureanu, *Antologia literaturii dialectale bănăţene. Poezie, proză, teatru* (1891–2011), Timişoara, Editura Universităţii de Vest, 2011.
- ALR.GMDT = Petru Neiescu, Eugen Beltechi, Ioan Faiciuc, Nicolae Mocanu, *Atlasul lingvistic român. Graiurile dintre Morava, Dunăre şi Timoc*, vol. IV. *Agricultura şi legumicultura; Pomicultura; Viticultura; Apicultura. Cănepa – Prelucrarea ei*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2021.
- ALR.Serie nouă = Emil Petrovici (coord.), *Atlasul lingvistic român, serie nouă, partea II*, vol. IV. A. *Şcoala*; B. *Armata*; C. *Conflicte, justiţie*; D. *Bani, comerţ*; E. *Măsuri, greutate*; F. *Bucătărie, mâncăruri, băuturi, alimente, coloniale*; G. *Tutun*; H. *Îmbrăcăminte, încălţăminte, farduri, podoabe, lucru de mână*; I. *Spălat, călcat, igienă* – vol. V. A. *Fire, caracter, sentimente*; B. *Petreceri, distracţii*; C. *Muzică*; D. *Jocuri de copii*; E. *Salutul*; F. *Varia*; G. *Nume de persoană*; H. *Superstiţii*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1965–1966.
- ATLPR = G. Alexici, *Texte din literatura poporană română*, vol. II, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1966.
- BCVU = Vasile Barbu, *Cuvinte vechi din graiul bănăţean al Uzdinului*, Uzdin, Societatea Literar-Artistică „Tibiscus”, 2012.
- Calvet 1998 = Louis-Jean Calvet, *La sociolinguistique*, troisième édition corrigée, édition actualisée, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1998.
- CGB = Lucian Costin, *Graiul bănăţean. Studii şi cercetări*, vol. I. 1. *Consideraţiuni generale asupra dialectului bănăţean*. 2. *Glosarul* – vol. II. 1. *Cuvinte introductive*. 2. *Glosarul*, Timişoara – Turnu Severin, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Cartea Românească” & Tipografia Luiza I. Niculescu şi Ion N. Bojneagu, 1926–1934.
- CTM = Ioan Cipu, *Toracul Mare. Pagini de istorie. Vorbire dăn Băbăluc (Vocabular torăcean)*, Timişoara, Editura Eurostampa, 2012.
- Densusianu 1997 = Ovid Densusianu, *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, vol. I. *Les origines* – II. *Le seizième siècle*. Ediţie critică şi note de V. Rusu. Prefaţă de B. Cazacu. Bucureşti, Editura „Grai şi Suflet – Cultura Naţională”, 1997.
- DLR = Marius Sala et alii (coord.), *Dicţionarul limbii române*, ediţie anastatică, tomurile I–XIX, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2010.
- DSR = Mile Tomici, *Srpsko-Rumunski rečnik/Dicţionar sârb-român*, vol. I. A–L, Temišvar, Savez Srba u Rumuniji, 1998.
- DVB = Vasile Linţia (coord.), *Dicţionarul vorbirii bănăţene*, ediţia a V-a, Timişoara, Asociaţia pentru Vorbirea Bănăţană. Downloadable at <<http://www.vorbireabanatana.ro/proiecte/alcatuirea-dictionarului-vorbirii-banatene/>> (accessed December 20, 2024), [s.a.].
- Evseev 2009 = Ivan Evseev, *Slavismele româneşti*. Volum îngrijit de Ilie Danilov şi Steva Perinaţ, Bucureşti, Editura CLRL, 2009.
- FA = Emil Petrovici, *Folclor din Valea Almăjului*. Ediţie îngrijită de Ion Mărin Almăjan, Timişoara, Editura Waldpress, 2005.
- Flora 1968 = Radu Flora, *Relaţiile sârbo-române. Noi contribuţii metodologice, istorice, culturale, lingvistice*, Panciovo, Editura Libertatea, 1968.
- Frăţilă 1993 = Vasile Frăţilă, *Contribuţii lingvistice*, Timişoara, Editura de Vest, 1993.
- Gămulescu 1974 = Dorin Gămulescu, *Elemente de origine sârbocroată ale vocabularului dacoromân*, Bucureşti–Pancevo, Editura Academiei & Editura Libertatea, 1974.

- Gămulescu 1983 = Dorin Gămulescu, *Influențe românești în limbile slave de sud*, vol. I. *Sârbocroata*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1983.
- GLRV 2009 = Constantin Frâncu, *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*, Iași, Editura Demiurg, 2009.
- GRBS = Maria Marin (coord.), *Graiuri românești din Banatul Sârbesc. Studiu lingvistic. Texte dialectale. Glosar*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2022.
- GRSVT = Mirela Zamilia Danciu, *Graiurile românești de la sud-vest de Timișoara*, Timișoara, Editura Eurostampa, 2011.
- Haspelmath 2004 = Martin Haspelmath, *Indefinite Pronouns*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hummel et alii 2018–2022 = Martin Hummel (coord.), *The third way: prepositional adverbials from Latin to Romance*, ORD Granted – Austria Institut für Romanistik/Department of Romance Philology, Karl-Franzens-Universität (Graz, Austria). Available at: <https://homepage.uni-graz.at/en/martin.hummel/projects/the-third-way-2018-2022/> (accessed November 18, 2023).
- ILR 2018 = Marius Sala, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Istoria limbii române*, vol. I, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2018.
- LGS = Gheorghe Lungu, *Glosar săcoșan. Vorbe de la noi și nu numai*, Timișoara, Editura Eurobit, 2014.
- LPSR = Micu Lazăr-Pârjol, *Sasca Română. Povestea satului meu*, Timișoara, Editura Mirton, 2007.
- Mării 2005 = I. Mării, *Note și studii de etimologie lexicală*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.
- MGG = Ion Murariu, *Vorbe d-ale noastre. Glosar girocean*, Timișoara, Editura Waldpress, 2014.
- Micle 2018 = Maria Micle, *Dialectul literar bănățean. Privire specială asupra epocii moderne*, București-Timișoara, Editura Academiei Române & Editura David Press, 2018.
- Mihăilă 1960 = G. Mihăilă, *Împrumuturi vechi sud-slave în limba română. Studiu lexico-semantic*, București, Editura Academiei, 1960.
- NALR.Banat = Petru Neiescu (coord.), *Noul atlas lingvistic român pe regiuni. Banat*, vol. I, București, Editura Academiei, 1980.
- NCB = Emilian Novacoviciu, *Cuvinte bănățene*, Oravița, Tipografia Felix Weiss, 1925.
- OHRM 2021 = Martin Maiden, Adina Dragomirescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Oana Uță Bărbulescu, Rodica Zafiu, *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2021.
- PDB = Ștefan Pătruț, *Dicționar regional de cuvinte în grai (zona Banat)*, Lugoj, Editura Dacia Europa Nova, 2002.
- PFRS = Ion Pătruț, *Folklor de la românii din Sârbia*, in „Anuarul Arhivei de Folklor”, 1942, 6, p. 329–384.
- PGB = Aurel Turcuș, Ionel Stoit, Vasile Barbu, *Poezie în grai bănățean*, vol. I–II, Timișoara, Editura Orizonturi Universitare, 2009.
- Popović 2009 = Virginia Popović, *Sârbisme în subdialectul bănățean și în literatura bănățeană*, in „Buletin științific. Filologie”, 18, 2009, p. 131–137.
- Popović 2010 = Virginia Popović, *Elemente sârbe în dialectul și literatura din Banat*, in „Limba și context”, 2010, 2, p. 87–90.
- RES = ***, *Serbian-English/English-Serbian Dictionary*. Downloadable at: <http://www.recnik.com/index-en-sr-c.html> (accessed November 18, 2023), [s.l.], [s.e.], [s.a.].
- Rosetti 1954 = Al. Rosetti, *Influența limbilor slave meridionale asupra limbii române (sec. VI–XII)*, București, Editura Academiei, 1954.
- Sala 1997 = Marius Sala, *Limbi în contact*, București, Editura Enciclopedică, 1997.
- ȘFR = Dumitru Șandru, *Folclor românesc*. Ediție îngrijită de Tudora Șandru Olteanu. Prefață de Ovidiu Bârlea, București, Editura Minerva, 1987.
- Sicoe 2017 = Cristina Raluca Sicoe, *Specificul lexico-semantic al împrumuturilor sârbești din subdialectul bănățean*, in „Quaestiones Romanicae”, 2017, 5, p. 307–322.
- Sicoe 2022 = Cristina Raluca Sicoe, *Terminologie de origine sârbă în literatura bănățeană*, Timișoara, Editura Universității de Vest, 2022.
- SLRV 2019 = Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *Sintaxa limbii române vechi*, consultant editor Martin Maiden, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2019.

- SOR 2016 = Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, consultant editor Martin Maiden, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Stan 2013 = Camelia Stan, *O sintaxă a limbii române vechi*, București, Editura Universității din București, 2013.
- TDR = Valeriu Rusu (coord.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Craiova, Editura Scrisul Românesc, 1984.
- TGR = Simion Todorescu-Răcovișanu, *Glosar de termeni dialectali din satul Racovița (județul Timiș)*, Timișoara, Editura Eurostampa, 2013.
- Trâpcea 1963 = Th. N. Trâpcea, *Cuvinte sârbești în subdialectul bănățean și importanța lor*, in „Scrisul bănățean”, 1963, 14 (107)/3, p. 68–76.
- Trâpcea 1964 = Th. N. Trâpcea, *Cuvintele de origine sârbească în graiul bănățean*, in „Analele Universității din Timișoara. Științe filologice”, 1964, 2, p. 266–275.
- Ungureanu 2017 = Cristina Ungureanu, *Dicționar de terminologie sociolingvistică*, Iași, Editura Institutul European, 2017.
- Weinrich 1979 = Uriel Weinrich, *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, with a preface by André Martinet, ninth printing, The Hague-Paris-New York, Mouton Publishers, 1979.

TRACES OF SERBIAN-ROMANIAN LINGUISTIC CONTACT
IN MORPHOSYNTAX. THE INDEFINITE PARTICLE – GODE
IN THE BANAT SUBDIALECT OF ROMANIAN LANGUAGE
(Abstract)

In this article, the author aims to highlight a grammatical, structural, and functional property that is used in a subdialect of Romanian (from the Banat region), namely the indefinite particle -GODE. Its presence in this region is based on a long-term Serbian-Romanian linguistic contact, as this particle is specific to the Serbian language, in which it has a similar usage.

As can be seen, by means of partial calque, this type of usage in the Serbian language was transmitted to Romanian Banatian subdialects (particularly those from the southwestern part of the region). It is of note that the grammatical particle in question prevailed whilst competing with older particles of Latin origin.

The viewpoints taken into consideration are numerous, with the etymological, lexical, grammatical, and dialectal perspectives taking precedence. For adequate argumentation, the author has based their opinion on linguistic facts gathered from linguistic atlases, dialectal glossaries, folkloric collections and materials from so-called Banat literature, and also from field research.

The novelty brought forward by this study is that, up to the present, in pages of specialized literature, there is no significant synthetic contribution to the knowledge of the place and role of this particle within the Romanian language.

Cuvinte-cheie: *limba română, subdialectul bănățean, particulă indefinită, gramatică, pronume, adjective și adverbe.*

Keywords: *Romanian, subdialect (Banat), indefinite particle, grammar, pronouns, adjectives and adverbs.*

Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai
Facultatea de Litere
Str. Horea, 31
adichircu@hotmail.com