

BABEŞ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY, CLUJ-NAPOCA,

FACULTY OF LETTERS

DOCTORAL THESIS

THE TENSE SYSTEM.

COMMON FEATURES IN ROMANIAN GRAMMARS

PUBLISHED BETWEEN 1757 AND 2010

ABSTRACT

DOCTORAL SUPERVISOR:

PROF. UNIV. DR. G .G. NEAMŢU

PH.D. CANDIDATE: CRISTINA CORCHEŞ

The thesis has in view the evolution of the verbal-temporal system, as presented in Romanian grammars that were published between 1757 and 2010. It emphasizes the common features that lead to creating the actual norm in the field. The thesis is structured into two sections followed by an annex that conveys the occurrence of forms having the future as a tense of reference. For this purpose we use various samples of spoken and written language cached during 2009 - 2012.

The first section, entitled *The Evolution of the Tense System in Romanian Grammars dating from the 18th to the 21st Centuries* has five chapters. Every chapter deals with different historical stages of Romanian grammar. Their delineation was done, mainly, according to the principles stated in *Istoria lingvisticii românești (The History of Romanian Linguistics)* (coordinated by Acad. Iorgu Jordan). Few exceptions were made in the fourth chapter (which deals with the stage between 1870 and 1963). In order to avoid similar interpretations, we analyzed a longer period of time. Our approach is consistently different from that of the above mentioned study, which took into consideration only three shorter periods of time, namely those between: 1870-1918, 1918-1944, and, irrespectively 1944-1970. In this matter, we may consider the following:

1. The period between 1757 and 1780 corresponds to the beginnings of Romanian grammar. All the grammar manuscripts were written using a compilation technique (calques), which is the main reason for us to tackle them solely on the basis of their historical value. Not to mention that there is sameness in presenting the features of the verbal-temporal systems at general extent of these grammars.
2. The period between 1780 and 1828 is the stage when first printed grammars appeared. In spite of their different orientations, they present many common elements that prove the linguistic unity of those times preceded the efforts for creating the Romanian standard language. Some papers that were elaborated back then, namely *Elementa linguae daco-romanæ sive valachicæ* and *Observații sau băgări de seamă asupra canoanelor gramaticii rumânești* will prove to be quite influential for the evolution in the matter.
3. The period between 1828 and 1870 is a time when the modernization of linguistics has aroused to such extent to which grammar managed to surpass the stage of direct rendering foreign patterns by means of progressive insights onto Romanian language in use. This is the period when a series of extremely valuable papers are published. We refer, among others, to those of Ion Heliade

Rădulescu, P.M. Câmpeanu, N. Bălăşescu or even to the first academic treatise conceived by Timotei Cipariu, which in spite of its Latinist exaggerations manages to disseminate several linguistic and terminological norms.

4. The period between 1870 and 1963 is characterized by the disappearance of the so-called purist trends in the Romanian linguistics, fact that enables the emergence of the first genuine scientific grammars. These grammars record in an objective manner the facts of language, separate grammatical issues from philological ones and state grammatical norms. They begin with from raw material extracted from both the cult and the folkloric literature, hence giving a plus of clarity to the stated rules.
5. The period between 1963 and 2010 gains in continuity, a feature which the previous stages lacked of. The grammars published during this stage contain thorough scientific descriptions and, from a certain point in time, their approach in regard to the various domains of grammatical structure will use different methods of investigation.

As for the first three stages, our research activity was focused on the primary works, works that established grammar as a discipline (*Gramatica rumânească (1757)* and *Institutiones linguae valachicæ*), as well as on those who played, for one reason or another, an important role in its evolution (*Elementa linguae daco-romanae sive valachicæ*, *Observații sau băgări de seamă asupra canoanelor gramaticii rumânești*, *Gramatica românească* written by Ion Heliade Rădulescu or *Gramatica limbii române* written by Timotei Cipariu). Each and every one of them was investigated from various points of view, namely: the composition of the verbal-temporal system, its organization, the inventory of forms, the typology of forms, the influence of foreign or Romanian models, the terminology used by the authors, the impact drawn onto further similar papers etc. As the grammars written before 1780 were, in general, neglected by the specialized studies due to the misconception they were nothing more than "simple copies of previous Slavic or Greek models", we were persuade to find some explanatory regarding about some of their authors' options. On this occasion we inserted an inventory of verbal-temporal forms from old Romanian. We also made a clear reference to all the data gathered in the two studies, stating, in successive close-ups, the changes that had taken place in its inventory, among which creating series of parallel forms or placing certain forms in the archaic register of the language).

In order to draw a global perspective on the Romanian verbal-temporal system within a certain historical period, we completed the picture of information depicted in the most

reliable grammars with other pieces of information taken from various sources. In respect to the period between 1828 and 1870 we proceeded to a systematization of works taking into account the criterion of origin: Wallachian grammars, Transylvanian grammars, and Moldavian grammars. In this way we managed to depict dialectal peculiarities of the kind.

The analysis of the verbal-temporal systems registered in the studies dealing with the stages between 1757 and 2010 emphasizes all sort of conclusions, which are specific to each and every stage, as we can see below:

I. The period between 1757 and 1780

At this early stage the verbal-temporal systems registered in the grammars has the following specific features: the lack of the *presumptive* mode; the interpretation of *gerund* as a tense of the *participle*; the absence of the *future in the past* and of the *perfect simple* from the inventory of the temporal subsystem of indicative (this is the case of Eustatievici's grammar). These peculiarities are due to the influence of the Latin model (the relationship between *gerund* and *participle*) or to the local type of the form (*perfect simple*), or to not recognizing the fact of language, as a consequence to its low frequency and to its novel character (lack of the *presumptive* and the *second future*).

However, the fact that the two grammars recorded these constructions does not necessarily mean they offer a true global perspective on the linguistic realities of the time. Both *Institutiones linguae valachicae* and *Gramatica rumânească* (1757) elude the questionable / doubtful forms, and register only the main constructions, the ones that represent the core of each temporal paradigm. By default, when several series of forms render the same temporal value (for instance, in the case of *the past perfect continuous* or of *the first future*), only the etymological ones are recorded (those inherited from Latin); the forms created on Romanian soil are left outside.

Due to the fact that the two works were not published, the Latin terms used by the author of the Kalocsa manuscript, as well as the traditional-archaic ones proposed by Dimitrie Eustatievici Braşoveanul, do not have any influence on the further evolution of the specific terminology in the field.

A contrastive study of the first Romanian grammars emphasizes a plus of scientific rigor which has been favorable to an anonymous author from the county of Bihor. He records tenses and forms omitted by the work of Eustatievici Braşoveanul (= *perfect continuous* and the adjacent expressions, the periphrases build with future as a tense of reference, created on the basis of aphaeresis forms of the auxiliary *a vrea* and the infinitive of verb to conjugate: *oi*

asculta; the super-composed forms with a value of *perfect continuous*: *am fost ascultat* or the ones with value of *conjunctive present*: *să ascult*), makes observations regarding the order of the mobile affixes that are contained in the structure, and also regarding the frequency with which the recorded structures appear in the oral or written register of the language. In addition, the grammar is noticeable for the quick recording of a series of linguistic innovations dating from the late half of the 18th century. We talk about analogical plural forms or about forms at first person with a rebuild desinence of the perfect simple.

II. The period between 1780 and 1828

By comparison with previous works, the grammars published during this stage record some new temporal values and means of expression, thus giving improved variants of the verbal-temporal system of Romanian language. At the level of the indicative subsystem *the perfect simple* becomes a constant value, which is expressed, in most of the cases, through analogical forms with the desinence *-ră-*. An exception is made in Ienăchiță Văcărescu's grammar, which, under the influence of Wallachian idioms, records only etymological forms.

The paradigm of the indicative includes old forms, imposed by the literary tradition: the desinence zero at *past perfect continuous*, sixth person, the homonymy between auxiliaries of third and sixth person at *past perfect* forms, the etymological forms of *synthetic past perfect*. In addition, some innovations taken from idioms penetrate the modern Romanian standard language: the auxiliary *a* in the *past perfect*, third person, in Văcărescu's grammar, or the desinence *-u* at *past continuous*, sixth person, in Constantin Diaconovici Loga's work. At the same time, other facts of language are taken from local idioms; they, unlike the ones mentioned above, will not impose themselves in the standard language, but will remain constant on the Dacoromanian linguistic territory. In this latter category we find periphrases with value of *past perfect continuous* containing *the past perfect* of the auxiliary *a fi* and *the participle* of the verb to conjugate: *am fost lăudat*, *am fost arat* etc., recorded by all the Transylvanian grammars, excepting the Wallachian grammar (the one written by Ienăchiță Văcărescu); we find, as well, periphrases with value of *past continuous*: *aveam mânca*, *aveam dormi* etc., recorded only in *Observații sau băgări de seamă asupra canoanelor gramaticii rumânești*.

Although they present a much richer inventory of forms, the grammars published in this stage do not manage to render the richness of means of expression through which the language of the late 18th century and of the beginning of the 19th century has been conveying certain temporal values.

In regard to the forms with future as a tense of reference, it is important to say that the first attestation of *the future in the past* in Romanian grammar was made at this stage, even though the tense was misplaced by Radu Tempea in the paradigm of the conditional and the conjunctive modes.

The temporal subsystems of the other modes, as well as the non-personal verbal forms, are calqued from Latin grammars, fact that creates organizational and paradigmatic confusions. That is the reason why these modes and forms will remain bookish relicts, meaning they won't be found in any other grammar published after 1828. However, in spite of many inconsistencies found at each level, we have to keep in mind that the works dating from this stage record, for the first time, an *infinitive* and a *conjunctive perfect*, the latter one with variable auxiliary, according to the norm in vigor at that time. They record, as well, a *conditional perfect* formed with *to want*: *vream ara, vream lăuda, vream vedea* etc., which was not included in the modern standard language, yet was wide spread in the old language.

The grammars published during this period contribute decisively to imposing a modern grammatical terminology. Most of the grammars resort to calques of foreign terms, which present afterwards in parallel with the old ones: *imperativă* (imperative) or *poruncitoare* (demanding), *optativă* (wishing) or *râvnitoare* (wanting), *prezente* (present) or *timpul cel de acum* (the time of now), *preteritu perfectu* (perfect preterit) or *trecutu săvârșitoriu* (the "making" past) etc. However, over the course of time and thanks to the efforts of Ion Budai-Deleanu and Constantin Diconovici Loga, authors that were preoccupied to adapt neologisms to the Romanian language system, a modern terminology, similar to the present terminology, is crystallized: *mode, tense, indicative, conjunctive, subjunctive, imperative, infinitive, gerund, supine, present simple, past perfect* etc.

The grammars published during 1780-1828 illustrate the initial phase of passing from the old stage to the modern standard one not only by virtue of the local and archaic aspect of language that they reflect, but also by the tendency of impose some linguistic and terminological innovations that will eventually enter in the standard usage.

III. The period between 1828 and 1870

By comparison to the previous grammars, the ones published during this stage bring forth a series of innovations. Some of these innovations are immediately imposed, while others need a longer period of time in order to become standard interpretations / models (until the late 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century). During this period,

- The constructions such as *voi fi cântat, oi fi cântat*, previously recorded by Radu Tempea in the paradigm of the *conditional past perfect continuous*, are correctly interpreted as forms with *the future* as a tense of reference. They become expression for the *second future*, being registered with this value by all the grammars published after Ion Heliade Rădulescu's one. The recognition of this new type gives a bipartite structure to the temporal system of the *future* in Romanian language and rises at 7 the number of tenses submitted to *the indicative*, thus completing the temporal configuration of this mode.;
- The bipartite temporal systems (*present – perfect*) of the *conditional* and *conjunctive* are enabled; however, they are competed by some wider systems, which appeared as a result of calquing the foreign models (see, for instance, the grammars of Golescu, Cîmpeanu, Seulescu, Laurian or Cipariu).;
- The bases for interpreting *the participle* as a non-personal verbal mode are put, though the old interpretation (= part of speech distinct from the verb) still remains the most spread one.;
- *The gerund* is recognized as a verbal form different from *the participle*, although, like in the case above, the old interpretation (= present participle) keeps floating around.;
- For the first time, the constructions such as: *voi fi lăudând, voi fi cântând* are registered, opening the gate for acknowledging a new mode: *the presumptive*.

The period of transition from the archaic phase towards the modern one is also reflected at the level of the language registered in these grammars. It is a stage of language which contains by far more elder elements than the further stage of language. Among them, we recall the iotacized verbal forms, the auxiliary *au* in the third person of the *past perfect*, the etymological forms of *past continuous*, sixth person or the variable forms of *conjunctive perfect*. The trend for imposing the linguistic innovations that will underlie the further standard common language can be seen at work in the first person forms, *present indicative* and *conjunctive*, in the third person forms of *present conjunctive*, namely in verbs with radix in *d, t, n, r* as well as in the *past perfect* auxiliary.

An important feature of this stage is rendered by the massive penetration in the Moldavian and Transylvanian grammars of forms that are specific to Wallachian idioms. Their extension has decisively contributed to the unification of local variants of Romanian language and, finally, had lead to create a unique standard norm, even though, on local terms,

it determined some oscillations between the traditional expressions and the ones that are wide accepted today.

As for the terminology, a progressive trend for replacing old Romanian terms (still well represented in the work of Iordache Golescu, *Băgări de seamă asupra canoanelor gramaticеști: timpul următor = prezent; nesăvârșit = imperfect; covârșit = mai mult ca perfect* etc.) with neological ones, taken from Latin, French or Italian grammars and adapted to Romanian language is quite noticeable. Towards the end of the stage, Timotei Cipariu brings forth an exclusively modern terminological system, which will be preserved, with few exceptions, by all the contemporary grammars.

IV. The period between 1870 and 1963

The changes that occurred in the grammars published between 1870 and 1963 illustrate: (1) the evolution towards the unification of a standard language, (2) the unification of theoretical interpretations, and (3) the crystallization of a wide-accepted terminology all over the country, which means the full employment of multilateral standardization of the Romanian verbal-temporal system.

At the end of the 19th century the standard language was already unified. The grammars present similar versions of the verbal-temporal system, which have no longer archaic and local forms. Thus, all the works prescribe the periphrases with *a* in the third person of past perfect, and the analogical expressions of simple perfect, fourth and fifth person. Furthermore, they recommend the forms with analogical desinence *-u* in the past continuous, sixth person, the structures with an invariable auxiliary in the *conjunctive perfect* (excepting the Pontbriant's grammar, which brings forth only the old forms) and the deiotacized variants for *the indicative* and the *conjunctive present*.

A different situation is found, however, in the case of plural forms of the synthetic *past continuous*, where the variations specific to the previous stage are still present. Thus, if the grammars published before 1890 recommended both the etymological and the analogical variants, the grammars published afterwards have been prescribing either the forms without *-ră-* (= most of them), or the forms with *-ră-*. In the end, in spite of the constraints made by the normative works, the forms with desinence will be imposed as unique standard variants, once the volume *Gramatica Academiei* is published.

At the opposite pole, the periphrastic *past perfect continuous* such as *am fost cântat*, benefits from a unitary approach, thus being registered in all the grammars we analyzed. However, due to some negative remarks made by the specialists, he will be virtually

eliminated from the inventory of structures accepted by the standard norm at the end of this stage.

The paradigm of *the future* tense is now enriched with two new forms: *am să cânt*, irrespective of *o să cânt*. However, the defining innovation of this period is the identification of two more tenses, *the presumptive present* and *the presumptive perfect*. One of them has a proper paradigm: *voi fi cântând, să fi cântând, aș fi cântând*, while the other one is conveyed through a homonymous form of *the future in the past*.

The temporal subsystems of conjunctive, conditional and infinitive do not experience their previous fluctuations any more. Instead, they benefit from a relative unitary approach that tackles a bipartite structure: *present – perfect*, which is adapted to the linguistic reality of the analyzed stage. In the plan of expression, these values are rendered through the constructions we find in the contemporary Romanian language, thus in the grammars that convey them.

The participle and *the gerund* are now considered two non-personal verbal modes, characterized by sets of proper features. This interpretation takes place for the old model of analysis, which stipulated that *the participle* was a part of speech distinct from the verb, whereas *the gerund* was a present tense within the verbal paradigm. But, while the morphological status of the two categories mentioned above is build in this stage, the status of *the presumptive* will raise controversies continued even after 1963. This new grammatical concept will be interpreted by different specialists as: mode, mode + tense, category not well constituted, or even as a double.

The neological terminology has a relative unitary character. Fluctuations that encompass sometimes the same work are few and insignificant, so they do not harm the cohesion of the denominative system.

V. The period between 1963 and 2010

The changes rendered after 1963 within the verbal-temporal system of the Romanian language are only few. They regard solely some of its levels, namely the sphere of posteriority and the inventories of forms submitted to *presumptive present* and *presumptive perfect*.

The most important innovation recorded in the contemporary stage is the reconfiguration of the temporal subsystem of the future tense. The classical bipartite temporal structure is replaced by the tripartite one, brought forth at the end of the stage in *GBLR*, 2010. The treatise acknowledges the fact that *the future in the past* is a grammatical tense, equal from the viewpoint of its status with *the future proper* and with *the future perfect*. *The future*

in the past is expressed by means of two types of structures: *aveam să cânt* and *urma să cânt*, the first structure being grammaticalized, unlike the second one.

In the paradigm of *the future proper*, the contemporary grammars include a new structure, ungrammaticalized, namely *urmează să cânt*. Things occur similarly in respect to the inventory of forms that associate the modal-temporal values of *the presumptive perfect*. This inventory is enriched with a homonymous form of *future proper* such as in *oi cânta*.

By excluding constructions like *oi fi cântat* and, implicitly, by restraining the paradigm of *the future in the past*, a specificity is conveyed to *the presumptive perfect*, a category to which many specialists have denied its grammatical status precisely because of its lack of paradigm proper. Due to the reconfigurations occurred at the level of the verbal-temporal system, *the presumptive perfect* appropriates, at the end of this stage, the following series of forms: *oi fi cântat* (= the specific one), *voi fi cântat*, *să fi cântat*, *aș fi cântat*.

The second section, entitled *Common Features in Romanian Grammars dating from the 18th Century – the 21st Century*, is structured into two chapters that reflect the features recalled in title, namely: the incomplete inventories of the forms with *the future* as a tense of reference and the inclusion of structures such as *a cânta*, *a lucra* etc. in the series of the structures that convey the feature [*simultaneity with t₀*].

In the first chapter of this section we present the diachronical evolution of the structures with the future as a tense of reference specific to Romanian language, as well as the inventory of proper expressions for each century. We insisted on the situation regarding the contemporary Romanian language and on the way in which it is reflected by *GALR 2005*.

In order to bring a more accurate data regarding the inventory of forms with the future as a tense of reference and their frequency in the Romanian language, we introduced the Annex 1. *Forms with the future as a tense of reference in the contemporary Romanian language (2009-2012)*, namely a corpus with spoken and written language samples, which grasp a great variety of language: oral discourse (= TV shows during the period 2009 and 2012), journalistic texts (= cultural, economic, sport magazines, editorials taken from different profile journals etc.), religious book, novels, essays etc. The data gathered from the corpus were processed and compared to the inventory of forms presented by the grammars of contemporary Romanian language, especially by *GALR, 2005*. We interpreted some allegations from the works above mentioned, such as: "the literary future is barely used in the current oral communication (a dialogue in which it appears will risk to sound artificial)" or "the colloquial future, *o să cânt*, is the most frequent form in Romanian spoken language".

The pieces of statistic information given by the corpus we investigated have been corroborated to those gathered by Meda Gabriela Gautschi after the analysis of other samples of contemporary Romanian language. Although they capture different proportions, the pieces of information gathered by the author lead to the same type of conclusions as ours, hence giving us a confirmation for some very actual trends.

The analysis in this chapter made clear that the Romanian future has its origins in one of the three modal periphrases used in the popular Latin to render the temporal value above mentioned: (a) *volo + infinitive* > *voi + infinitive* (= *voi cânta*), (2) *habeo + (ad) + infinitive* > *am + (a) + infinitive* (= *am a cânta/ am să cânt*) and (3) *esse + participle future (passive) in -ndus* > form of future I of the verb *a fi + gerund* (= *voi fi cântând*). These forms underlie a complex temporal system in the structure of which enter 24 constructions specialized in rendering the temporal value [*posteriority towards de t₀*]. However, from the 16th century until today this system has never had simultaneously such a great number of members. This fact is due, mainly, to the formal and semantic instability of its components. The components either were eliminated from usage: *am a cânta*, or created parallel series: *oi cânta, o să cânt* etc., or changed entirely their semantic content: *voi fi cântând*.

In the 17th century the inventory of forms with the future as a tense of reference contained the following structures: *voi cânta, voi să cânt, am a cânta, voi fi cântând* and *voi fi cântat*, organized in a bipartite system: *future I – future in the past*. In the next century, some changes determine the occurrence of new formal variants and the modification of the semantic status for some of the existent variants, namely:

- i. the series of constructions that contain the auxiliary *a vrea* enriches with parallel forms *oi cânta, oi să cânt, oi fi cântând, oi fi cântat*, resulted after the aphaeresis of the initial consonant of the auxiliary;
- ii. the series of the constructions that contain the auxiliary *a avea* enriches with the periphrasis *am să cânt*;
- iii. the future formed with *cu a fi* suffers important semantic changes; its gerundial variant (*voi fi cântând*) begins to lose its initial temporal meaning and to specialize as a modal form of *presumptive*; a similar process, not such intense though, is suffered by the participial variant (*voi fi cântat*), which, depending on the context, associates either a temporal value, or a modal one (of *the presumptive perfect*).

In the 18th century the most important changes occur in the series of forms that contain the auxiliaries *a vrea* and *a fi*. In this respect:

- i. by comparison to the previous stages, a decreasing in frequency for the periphrasis *voi să cânt* is registered;
- ii. in the system penetrates the innovation *o să cânt*, derived from the intermediary form *oi să cânt*, by reducing the auxiliary to an invariable form *o*;
- iii. the construction *voi fi cântând* glides from the temporal sphere in the modal one, being definitively eliminated from the inventory of means of expressing the future.

After the reconfigurations, the inventory of forms that associate the temporal feature [posteriority towards t_0] will remain, broadly speaking, the same in the 19th century. It contains the following constructions: *voi cânta*, *oi cânta*, *voi să cânt*, *oi să cânt*, *o să cânt*, *am a cânta*, *am să cânt*, *voi fi cântat* and *oi fi cântat*. In the 20th century, two of them: *oi să cânt* and *am a cânta* suffer profound structural shifts which determine their elimination from the language.

The analysis of the temporal subsystem of the future in the contemporary Romanian language shows a series of mutations in respect to the previous stage. These changes are caused by the formal instability and, moreover, by the semantic instability of the forms contained. The changes are significant, ranging from the disappearance of some forms to the emergence of other forms and from the neutralization of some temporal opposition to the extension of the tenses inventory.

One of the major changes in respect to the previous stages of language development is the new configuration of the temporal complex, which contains now four grammatical tenses: *the future proper*, *the future perfect*, *the future in the past* and *the future in the future*, the greatest number registered ever. In spite of this new linguistic reality, most of the contemporary grammars convey only *the future proper* and *the future perfect*, bringing forth the classic bipartite system registered in older works (namely in the ones from the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century). *GBLR* brings next the two tenses *the future in the past*, presenting a tripartite system, but, following the path of the other grammars, does not mention a thing about the existence of *the future in the future*.

Among the four members of the category, the one that holds the strong position in the system is *the future proper*. With the aid of temporal complements, temporal conjunctions, and sometimes by the "logic of things", it can render all the values that are proper to the other tenses of the sphere of posteriority. Its permutable character determines the cancellation of the temporal oppositions: *future proper* – *future perfect*, *future proper* – *future in the past* and *future proper* – *future in the future*, the restraint in usage for the less productive forms and

their progressive elimination from the oral and the written register of the language. The consolidation of the *future I* in respect to the other types is also shown by the analysis made on the corpus conveyed by the Annex 1. At this level, the *future I* is registered with a **97,30%** frequency, as compared to a 0,95% frequency for *the future perfect* (tense not found in the oral register), to a 1,75% frequency for *the future in the past* and to a 0% frequency for *the future in the future*.

In the contemporary Romanian language, the temporal value of *the future proper* can be rendered by eight series of forms, double as compared to the number of forms in the previous stage. To the four periphrases already established: *voi cânta, oi cânta, o să cânt, am să cânt* the archaic structure *voi să cânt* and three more constructions, not yet stated, but with strong potential of grammaticalization in the next stage (= observation valid especially for the first of them): *urmează să cânt, sunt pe punctul de a cânta, sunt pe cale să cânt* are added.

The future of the type *voi să cânt*, which was said to be disappeared from the language, is still shown in several types of texts: religious ones: *...că Hristos va să pătimească și că, fiind El primul înviat din morți, luminează va vesti, și poporului, și neamurilor...* (B.NT.FA); cultural-based ones: *Textul de față reprezintă o versiune intermediară, în continuare de lucru, între conferința cu același titlu prezentată la Cluj, pe data de 12 iunie 2009, și o carte ce va să vină, pe măsura (scurgerii) istoriei.* (IDEA.1) or journalistic ones: *Răul pe care-l cunoști sau răul ce va să vie?* (G.FN.3) etc. Hence, in spite of its low frequency, we consider that this type has to be included in the inventory of means of expression for *the future* in the contemporary Romanian language, especially in the exhaustive one presented by a further academic treatise.

From among the eight types of constructions mentioned above, the standard future (= *voi cânta*) has, according to the data given by our excerpted material, as well as to the data presented by Meda Gabriela Gautschi in her work, *Studio contrastivo degli usi del futuro in italiano e romeno: lingua scritta e lingua parlata a confronto*, the greatest frequency both in the oral register and in the written register of language. These new statistic information denies a series of allegations that, over time, have received a semi-axiomatic character, namely: "the literary future is barely used in the current oral communication (a dialogue in which it appears will risk to sound artificial); the series is associated to a certain solemnity and to the written variant of the standard language" or "the colloquial future, *o să cânt*, is the most frequent form in Romanian spoken language".

Whereas the form *voi cânta* strengthens its position within the system, the variant with aphaeresis auxiliary *oi cânta*, found in language even in the 17th century, is less and less used

with temporal value (= 21 occurrences (= 1,57%) from a sum of 1337 registered in the whole corpus). It passes through a process of resemantization, becoming more and more specialized in rendering epistemic significations (= hypotheses) specific to *the presumptive present*.

By contrast with the paradigm of *the future proper*, which is submitted to a process of extension, the paradigm of *the future perfect* experiences just the opposite, a process of restraint, as a result of eliminating the form *oi fi cântat* from the system, which became specialized in rendering the modal value of *the presumptive perfect*. The restraint of the paradigm, corroborated to the low frequency of *the future perfect* in the contemporary Romanian and to the fact that *the future proper* takes over its temporal signification, confirm a trend noticed long before by Iorgu Iordan, namely that the future perfect, as a strictly temporal verbal form, is about to disappear from the language.

The future in the past, slightly better represented in language than *the future perfect*, (1,75% compared to 0,95%), expresses itself through four types of constructions, one of which being grammaticalized: *aveam să cânt* and three others ungrammaticalized: *urma să cânt*, *eram pe punctul de a cânta*, *eram pe cale de a cânta*. In spite of the fact that, from the viewpoint of the structure cohesion, it finds itself to an inferior functional level as compared to *aveam să cânt*, the type *urma să cânt* has a greater frequency in language, being a proof for the trend of extension that will lead, probably, to the grammaticalization of this form in the next stage.

The future in the future, a peripheral type, with rare occurrences, finds its support at the level of expression in the super-composed construction formed by the form of *future proper* of the verb *a avea* and *the conjunctive* of the verb to conjugate: *Peste un an vei fi în clasa I, iar peste doi vei avea să fii într-a doua*. Along with *am să cânt* and with *avem să cânt*, it forms the triadic system of the tenses build with *a avea + conjunctive*.

Analyzing the evolution of the temporal subsystem of the future in Romanian language, we show the instability of forms specialized in rendering the value [*posteriority towards t₀*], feature that can be extended over the entire category. This instability manifests itself both at the expression and at the content. Hence, as new forms enter in the system, the old ones, already established in rendering this temporal dimension, become obsolete and are eliminated from the inventory of the means of expressing posteriority. Due to this kind of variations, Romanian grammars, no matter in what stage or under what methodological orientation they were published, have presented a fragmented picture of the focused subsystem.

In the second chapter of this section we analyze the questionable temporal value of the forms such as *a cânta*, which are interpreted traditionally as *infinitive present*. Besides this wide spread interpretation in the specialized literature, the focused constructions have been analyzed before as *infinitive atemporal*, *omnitemporal*, *nontemporal* etc. However, the theoretical models mentioned above reflect only partially the temporal specificity of these constructions. The constructions, in their hypostasis of non-personal verbal forms cannot occur alone in the phrase; they claim the presence in the structure of a verb in personal mode; this verb would express, through specific morphemes, all the grammatical categories of the class that contains it, among which the tense. Between the form of infinitive and the verb in personal mode (the predicate of the sentence) a temporal relationship of simultaneity is established. On the basis of this relationship, it reiterates the temporal value of its regent. By comparison to the tense of the verb in personal mode, the tense of infinitive will be always a **tense of second rank**, a **reiterated tense**. In conclusion, the infinitive "present" is, in fact, a form that actualizes contextually its temporal reference, on the basis of an anaphoric relationship with the verb in personal mode, which stands for its referential source. Hence, it is a **pro-form**, or, more precisely, a **pro-tense**.

Table of contents

Foreword 8

SECTION I. The Evolution of the Tense System in Romanian Grammars Dating from the 18th to the 21st Century 13

First Chapter. The Stage between 1757 and 1780 14

I. First Romanian Grammar. Dimitrie Eustatievici Braşoveanu – Gramatica rumânească (1757) 15

A. The Models of Gramatica rumânească (1757) 16

B. The Specificity of the Mode and Tense System brought forth by Gramatica rumânească (1757) 22

1. The Tense Subsystem of the Indicative 27

a) Present 29

b) Past Continuous 29

c) Past Perfect 30

d) Past perfect Continuous 32

e) Future 36

2. The Tense Subsystem of the Imperative 43

3. The Tense Subsystem of the Conditional-Optative 46

4. The Tense Subsystem of the Conjunctive 55

5. The Non-personal Verb Forms 57

II. First Romanian Grammar Written in Latin. Institutiones linguæ valachicæ 61

A. Controversies regarding the Space-Time Placing, the Paternity and the Sources of The Kalocsa Manuscript 61

B. The Specificity of the Tense System brought forth by Institutiones linguæ valachicæ 64

1. The Tense Subsystem of the Indicative 66

a) The Perfect Simple 67

b)	The Analytical Past Perfect Continuous	69
2.	The Tense Subsystem of the Imperative, Conditional, and Conjunctive	70
3.	The Non-personal Verb Forms	72
III.	Concluding Remarks	74
Second Chapter. The Stage between 1780 and 1828		76
A.	The Specificity of the Tense System brought forth by <i>Elementa linguæ daco-romanæ sive valachicæ</i> ⁷⁷	
B.	The Specificity of the Tense System brought forth by <i>Observații sau băgări de seamă asupra regulilor și orândueleur grammaticii rumânești (1787)</i>	83
C.	The Influence brought by <i>Elementa linguæ daco-romanæ sive valachicæ</i> and by <i>Observații sau băgări de seamă asupra regulilor și orândueleur grammaticii rumânești</i> on Further Descriptive and Normative Works, with Special Attention on the Grammars of Radu Tempea and Constantin Diaconivici Loga	93
D.	Concluding Remarks	101
Third Chapter. The Stage between 1828 and 1870		103
A.	The Specificity of the Tense System brought forth by <i>Gramatica românească (1828)</i>	105
B.	The Tense System and the Rules of Standard Language. Unity and Diversity in Romanian Wallachian, Transylvanian, and Moldavian Grammars dating from the Middle of the 19th Century	116
C.	The Specificity of the Tense System brought forth by <i>Gramatec'a limbei române (I Analitica, 1869)</i>	127
D.	Concluding Remarks	135
Fourth Chapter. The Stage between 1870 and 1963		139
A.	Standardizing the Romanian Tense System. Completeng the Inventory of Forms	140
1.	The Tense Subsystem of the Presumptive	146
a)	Origin and Evolution of the Forms of Presumptive Present	147
b)	Origin and Evolution of the Forms of Presumptive Perfect	150
c)	Grammatical Status. Interpretative Models	150
B.	Concluding Remarks	155
Fifth Chapter. The Stage between 1963 and 2010		157

SECTION II. Common Features in Romanian Grammars Dating from the 18th to the 21st Century 161

First Chapter. The Incomplete Inventory of Verbal Forms with Future as a Tense of Reference 162

- A. Origin of Forms of Future 164
- B. Future Proper 184
 - a) Inventory of Forms. Morphematic Structure 184
 - b) Tense Values 197
 - c) Mode Values 201
 - d) Aspect Values 202
- C. Future Perfect 203
 - a) Inventory of Forms. Morphematic Structure 205
 - b) Tense Values 205
 - c) Mode Values 206
 - d) Aspect Values 206
- D. Future in the Past 207
- E. Less than the Future or Post Future or Future in the Future 209
- F. Concluding Remarks 210

Second Chapter. Remarks on the Tense Values of the Infinitive "Present" 216

Concluding Remarks 229

Index 241

- A. Grammars, Journals, Periodicals, Dictionaries – Abbreviations 241
- B. Sources 242
- C. Sources used for purpose of Illustration 246
- D. The Content of Corpus presented in Annex 1. Forms with Future as a Tense of Reference in Romanian Spoken and Written Language – Samples taken from the period between 2009-2012 246
 - I. Television Shows 246
 - II. Written Press 247

1.	Cultural Press	247
2.	Editorials	247
3.	Economic Press	249
4.	Sports Press	250
III.	Religious Book	251
IV.	Literature	252

Bibliography 253

Annex 1. Forms with Future as a Tense of Reference in Contemporary Romanian Language
(2009-2012) 272

Key Words: Tense System, Verb, Tense, Pro-Tense, Etymological Forms, Analogical Forms, Future, Infinitive Present, Descriptive Grammars, Terminology, Old Romanian Language, Contemporary Romanian Language, Diachronic Analysis