The loss of analyticity in the history of Romanian verbal morphology

Adina Dragomirescu, Alexandru Nicolae, and Rodica Zafiu

Abstract
This chapter investigates the relation between syntheticity and analyticity in the history of Romanian. We empirically note that, against the traditional hypothesis that in the passage from Latin to Romance older synthetic forms were extensively replaced by novel analytic formations, there is a set of old Romanian periphrastic constructions which disappeared in the passage to modern Romanian, and we set our goal to provide an explanation for this less frequent linguistic change. By bringing to the fore data from old and modern Romanian, as well as dialectal Daco-Romanian material, we show that the facts are best explained by appealing to structural factors (i.e. the feature matrix of Romanian auxiliaries) rather than functional factors (competition between functionally equivalent forms, learnèd nature, or rare occurrence in usage).
Keywords: Romanian, verb morphology, syntheticity, analyticity, periphrasis, inflexional simplicity

8.1 Introduction, outline and minimal theoretical assumptions
Addressing the general relation between syntheticity and analyticity in the passage from Latin to Romance, this chapter analyses the diachronic development of verbal periphrases in the passage from old to modern Romanian, including its dialectal varieties; only Daco-Romanian and its regional varieties are considered in this study, while the sub-Danubian historical dialects have not been taken into account. Our analysis starts from the empirical observation that in the passage from old to modern Romanian, despite the loss of some inherited synthetic formations (see Maiden 2018:29-43), there is a subset of novel periphrastic formations which disappeared from the standard language, with just some relics preserved dialectally.

While traditional scholarship argued that synthetic forms were replaced *tout court* by analytic formations in the transition from Latin to Romance (cf. Schlegel 1818 and many references thereafter), more recent work has argued against such a radical view (Schwegler 1990; Ledgeway 2012 and, especially, 2017[1]), focusing on the cross-Romance variation in this area and highlighting the particular developments of each Romance variety in turn[2]. In this respect,

---

[1] Cf. also Coseriu's (1987, 1988) distinction between 'internal' and 'external' structures, onto which he develops the hypothesis that that the Romance languages are distinguished from Latin by an iconic typology whereby relational concepts (external structures) receive relational, 'syntagmatic' (i.e. analytic) exponence and non-relational concepts (= internal structures) receive non-relational, 'paradigmatic' (i.e. synthetic) exponence. As Coseriu himself admits, this principle is not without exceptions.

[2] The disappearance of newly coined periphrases is found in other Romance idioms as well. Consider French, for example. The periphrases made up of the verb *estre* (*être*) 'be' or *aller* 'go' plus a present participle go extinct (Squartini 1999:27; Buridant 2000:357-8); the loss of periphrases whose lexical verb occurs in the gerund is also attested in Italian, Occitan, Galician, and Portuguese (Squartini 1999:28-9). Of the numerous compound auxiliary forms of French – double auxiliary + past participle: *j'ai eu fait* (I-have.AUX.1SG have.AUX make.PTCP), *j'avais eu fait* (I-have.AUX(IMPF).1SG have.AUX make.PTPC), *j'aurais eu fait* (I-have.AUX(COND).1SG have.AUX make.PTPC), etc., see Ayres Bennett & Carruthers (1992) –, the only one which has been preserved in non-standard and regional French (in the south) is the one employing the auxiliary in the compound past (the "passé surcomposé") – *j'ai eu fait*, see Carruthers (1994), Apothéloz (2010), Melchior (2012), etc. Note that there is a formal correspondence between this form and a Romanian compound auxiliary form preserved dialectally – *am fost dat* (have.AUX.1SG be.AUX give.PTCP) (see example (24) below). In the particular case of French, the demise of many of these periphrases might have been favoured by the fact that they were largely ignored or condemned by the French grammars (Ayres Bennett & Carruthers 1992).

Romanian developed in the course of its history a number of novel periphrastic formations in the verbal domain which, although continuing in many other Romance varieties (cf. Squartini 1998), did not survive into the modern language; older synthetic formations characterized by greater morphemic simplicity (understood as smaller number of morphemes involved) prevailed diachronically. The loss of this subset of periphrases raises some non-trivial problems concerning the broader Romance typological tendencies and the relation between syntheticity and analyticity/periphrasis, hence the main research question to which our analysis seeks to provide an answer is why some novel periphrastic formations disappeared from the language, while others have survived to the present day.

The first three sections of this chapter present an empirical overview of the changes in the verb system from the perspective of the interplay between syntheticity and a subtype of analytic structures (i.e. periphrastic forms), throwing light on the differences between old Romanian (§8.2) and modern standard (§8.3) and dialectal (§8.4) Romanian. These are then addressed from a theoretical perspective (§8.5); our analysis will show that the auxiliaries of these now defunct periphrases share a set of properties concerning the encoding of TAM (i.e. they have a richer feature matrix) which sets them apart from the auxiliaries of the surviving periphrases, this accounting for the demise of the former subset of periphrases.

For the concepts 'analytic(ity)' and 'periphrastic/periphrasis', we adopt the framework established in the introduction to this volume (see Ledgeway, Smith & Vincent, current volume), 'periphrasis' generally referring to a set of analytic forms that realize the cells of an inflexional paradigm that are typically realized by inflexional forms elsewhere in the paradigm; note that not all patterns traditionally included under the heading 'analytic' may be considered 'periphrastic' (see Ledgeway, Smith & Vincent, current volume; see also §8.5.2 below). In this chapter we focus on periphrases with TAM auxiliaries (as opposed to auxiliaries whose feature matrix encodes other grammatical categories, e.g. voice auxiliaries); we adopt a generally accepted definition of auxiliaries such as that given in Anderson (2006)[3], which is convergent with the general view on auxiliaries in grammaticalization theory (cf. Heine 1993; Kuteva 2001). Although our analysis is empirically oriented, we adopt the spirit of the rather uncontroversial generative idea (developed by Cinque 1999 and much subsequent literature: see Ledgeway 2012 and Schifano 2018 i.a. for cross-Romance overviews, and Nicolae 2015, 2019 for Romanian) that the inflectional domain (= the structural portion where TAM information is hosted) is made up of three dedicated projections/fields of projections, hierarchically ordered (mood > tense > aspect)[4]. Our analysis endorses a compositional view (see Comrie 1985:76 on compositionality in the encoding of TAM, and Vincent 2015 on compositionality and language change), assuming that there is a division of labour between the components of a periphrasis with respect to the encoding of TAM information.

---

[3] "[A]uxiliaries are not discrete entities per se but rather mono-clausal form–function combinations occupying a non-discrete space on several large form–function continua that include serial verb constructions, clause-chaining, and verb plus complement clause combinations on the one hand and tense-aspect-mood affixes on the other" (Anderson 2006:4).

[4] We adopt a traditional, widely accepted view of the TAM categories; see Comrie (1976) on Aspect, Comrie (1985) on Tense, and Palmer (2001) on Mood.

8.2 Periphrastic forms in old Romanian[5]

Old Romanian is characterized by a larger number of analytic verb forms than modern Romanian, some of which have been considered calques due to the translation of learnèd texts from Old Church Slavonic or Greek (see Manoliu 1959; Arvinte 1993; but cf. Zafiu 2016:45). However, the fact that they have been preserved in regional varieties of Romanian shows that they are the products of natural and internal linguistic change, and allows us to surmise that they were genuinely present in actual usage in old Romanian.[6] As we shall see, a striking formal characteristic of old Romanian is the systematic correspondence between constructions with FI 'be' plus past participle and FI 'be' plus gerund (present participle)[7] (see §§8.2.2, 8.2.3).

8.2.1 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the infinitive

In the sixteenth century the set of periphrases with the lexical verb occurring as a bare infinitive includes the *voi*-future (1a) and the *aş*-conditional (2a), as well as periphrases headed by the auxiliary VREA ('want'). The direct selection of a bare infinitive generally indicates a high degree of grammaticalization, and hence the fact that they had grammaticalized in an earlier (and unattested) stage of Romanian (Caragiu Marioţeanu 1969:268). This is in contrast to other complex predicates in the sixteenth century where the lexical verb is introduced by the infinitival marker *a* 'to'. A more recent and less grammaticalized type of future (rare and gradually abandoned towards the end of the seventeenth century, see Zamfir 2007:232-41) was based on the *a*-infinitive (1b). The two types of future developed – through two of the main pathways of grammaticalization (see Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994:254-64) – from constructions with VREA 'want' (the agent-oriented modality of desire) and AVEA 'have' (the agent-oriented modality of obligation, derived from possession). The former was extremely frequent and clearly temporal, while the latter remained rare and preponderantly modal. The auxiliary (1a) was not yet differentiated from lexical 'want' from a formal point of view in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

(1) a vedea-   veri   slava   lu   Dumnezeu
         see.INF=   want.AUX.2SG[8]   glory.DEF   GEN   God
         'you will see the glory of God' (CC².1581:99)
     b de   acmu oameni   ai   a   vâna
         from now   man.PL   have.AUX.2SG to   hunt.INF
         'from now on you will hunt men' (CC².1581:367)

[6] The idea that these analytic structures are productive and cognate with other Latin-Romance patterns – with learnèd Old Church Slavonic or Greek influences functioning as a catalyst at a certain point – was promoted by Frâncu (1983-84; 2012; 2014).
[7] Traditional grammars discuss these *-nd* forms under the heading Rom. *gerunziu* / 'gerund'. As formatives of periphrases, their actual function is that of a present participle (see Nicula 2013).
[8] *Glossing conventions.* Note that in the glosses the transparent auxiliaries have been translated (e.g. the future auxiliary *veri* is glossed 'want.AUX') as and the opaque ones have received only the structural description (e.g. the conditional auxiliary *aş* is glosses as 'AUX.COND'). For auxiliaries, the mood and tense information is only mentioned in the text, not reflected in the interlinear glosses.

There was significant variation in the inventory of periphrases based on the future which initially had the value of a future in the past, later becoming conditionals. The most frequent analytic conditional, which is preserved in present-day Romanian, involves the auxiliary *aș/ai/ar(ă)/am/ați/ar(ă)* and the bare infinitive (2a). Despite many etymological controversies (including Weigand 1896; Rosetti 1932:104; Philippide 1927; Elson 1992; Ivănescu 1980/2000:163; see Zafiu 2017 for a review), the most plausible hypothesis is that the auxiliary originates from past forms (imperfect, perhaps contaminated with the simple past) of the future auxiliary VREA 'want'. In modern Romanian, the standard analytic form of the conditional (*aș merge* '(I) would go') has only modal values; presumably, in an earlier period it must have also had a temporal value (as a future in the past[9]), similarly to its equivalents in other languages (see also §8.5.1).[10] A variant of the construction uses the 'transparent' auxiliary VREA 'want' in the imperfect: *vrea/vreai/vrea/vream/vreați/vrea* + bare infinitive (2b), with a contextually dependent interpretation, either as a future in the past or as a conditional.

(2) a   eu   n-   aș   fi   derept
        I   not=   AUX.COND.1SG   be.INF right
        'I would not be right' (CC[2].1581:93)
     b   minciuna   amu   vrea   fi   aiavea
        lie.DEF   then   want.AUX.3SG   be.INF   real
        'Then the lie would be real' (CC[2].1581:186)

A third, even rarer, analytic form was based on the volitional auxiliary in the compound past (*am vrut/ai vrut/au vrut/am vrut/ați vrut/au vrut*) plus the bare infinitive (3).[11]

(3) au   vrut   vrea   amu   a   munci
     have.AUX.3PL want.AUX   want.INF   then   to   torment.INF
     'then they would have wanted to torment' (CC[2].1581:414)

With the exception of the *voi*-future and the *aș*-conditional, all the formations discussed in this section disappeared in the passage from old to (standard) modern Romanian. The now defunct analytic conditional with the 'transparent' imperfect of the auxiliary VREA 'want' is functionally equivalent to the canonical *aș*-conditional, whose form of the auxiliary was no longer transparent. Also, the conditional with VREA 'want' in the compound past plus bare

---

[9] The existence of a future in the past which developed counterfactual and conditional values is well-attested in the Balkan languages, both in diachrony (see, for Greek, Markopoulos 2009:2016-18, and, for Bulgarian, Kuteva 2001:109), and in synchrony. The phenomenon is not conditioned by the absence of SOT/Double Access Reading in the Balkan languages: even if the future in the past is not *determined* (by a superordinate tense) (cf. D'Hulst, Coene & Avram 2004:357), it is permitted and attested in texts.

[10] Some occurrences of this analytic form can be found in the earliest attested Romanian texts (of the sixteenth century), in contexts where it is impossible to assign them a conditional meaning. Densusianu (1938:231-2) interpreted them as mere translation errors (influenced by the Hungarian and Latin sources), i.e. as uses of conditional analytic forms instead of past tense forms. However, it is possible to see them as future in the past periphrases, used in a narrative context.

[11] Witness the regularity shown by VREA 'want' as illustrated by example (3): as an auxiliary, it selects a bare infinitive (*au vrut vrea* 'they would have wanted'), while as a lexical verb, it selects an *a*-infinitive (*vrea a munci* 'want to torment'). In the latter construction, the infinitive is systematically replaced by the subjunctive.

infinitive was replaced by the perfect conditional, formed with the 'opaque'[12] auxiliary *aş* and the invariable auxiliary FI 'be' plus past participle (see §8.3 below).

The case of the AVEA 'have' + *a*-infinitive future is different: it was lost as a consequence of the spread of the equivalent construction based on the subjunctive (*am să merg* have.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG '(I) will go'), part of the (incomplete) replacement of the infinitive by the subjunctive in Romanian, a Balkan Sprachbund phenomenon (see also fnt. 11). Other constructions, which we will not discuss here in detail as they do not satisfy the criteria for being considered auxiliary-based configurations of the same structural type (see §8.5.2 for a discussion), originate from the substitution of the infinitive by the subjunctive: *voi* + infinitive > *voi* + subjunctive (the *o să*-future diachronically derives from this structure after the first component became invariable, namely *o* < *oa [wa] < *va* 'wants', cf. Ivănescu 2000:418); VREA + infinitive > VREA + subjunctive. These constructions featured either double inflexion, both on the auxiliary and on the lexical verb (e.g. *am să merg* have.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG, *voi să merg* want.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG 'I will go'), or simple inflexion, on the lexical verb (*o să merg* PRT SBJV go.SBJV.1SG 'I will go'). There are no modal (i.e. grammatical) differences, but only sociolinguistic differences, between these future periphrases in modern Romanian. Only one of each of these periphrastic pairs has been preserved: *voi merge* want.AUX.1SG go.INF (but not *voi să merg* want.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG) and *am să merg* have.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG (but not *am a merge* have.AUX.1SG to go.INF); this split most probably occurred as an effect of the different patterns of infinitive-by-subjunctive diachronic replacement (note that the infinitive has not been replaced by the subjunctive across-the-board).

Of the conditional periphrases, only the form made up of an opaque auxiliary with no obvious tense inflection and the infinitive (the *aş*-conditional) has been preserved in standard Romanian, the structure with an auxiliary which is overtly inflected for tense (*vrea/am vrut*) having been over time eliminated.

8.2.2 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the past participle
The compound past formed with the auxiliary AVEA 'have' (*am/ai/a(u)/am/aţi/au*) (4) was very frequent and fully grammaticalized in the sixteenth century (*au mers* have.AUX.3SG/PL=go.PTCP / *mers-au* go.PTCP=have.AUX.3SG/PL 'he/they went'). The only difference with respect to the modern-day use of the form was its frequency in relation to the simple past inherited from Latin. The simple past is well represented, especially in learnèd texts, and the opposition between the simple past and the compound past still preserved a semantic basis, the first being a true preterite (i.e. a past punctual perfective form), and the latter functioning more similar to a present perfect in some contexts, although exhibiting a tendency to overlap with the simple past (Zafiu 2016:33-5).

(4)   Iară acest   bolnav n-   au   făcut   aşa,
       and this   ill   not= have.AUX.3SG do.PTCP   like.this
       ce   şi   pren   târg   trecu.
       but   also   through   town   go.IND.PST.3SG
       'And this ill man did not do so, but also went even through the town' (CC².1581:56)

---

[12] An 'opaque' auxiliary is an auxiliary whose relation to its lexical source is no longer transparent due to various historical factors (phonetic erosion, morphological attrition, etc.).

There is a consistent set of periphrases built with the auxiliary FI 'be' ((5)-(6)); Old Church Slavonic BE-based periphrases are considered to have influenced the old Romanian BE-based periphrases (Sandfeld 1930:149). In old Romanian it was possible to form periphrases with the past participle and the auxiliary FI 'be' in almost all modal and temporal forms, with the exception of the simple past and of the imperative. The periphrasis based on BE in the present indicative (which occurs mostly with, but is not restricted to, unaccusatives) – interpreted as a BE-based compound past/present perfect (Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2013) or as a copula verb + predicative – is very infrequent (Zamfir 2007:74), hence it has not been considered in our analysis.

The auxiliary had a synthetic form in the imperfect (5a), the pluperfect (5b), the subjunctive (5c) and the synthetic conditional (5d). The periphrasis with the auxiliary in the imperfect had the value of a pluperfect (Densusianu 1938:224). The periphrasis with the auxiliary in the subjunctive, which had the value of a perfect subjunctive, was attested in the sixteenth century; the auxiliary later became completely invariable in the nineteenth century (Frâncu 1970). Extremely rare was the construction with the auxiliary in the synthetic conditional. This form, which resulted from a mixture of Latin perfect subjunctive and future perfect (like the Ibero-Romance future subjunctive), disappeared after the sixteenth century (Maiden et al 2021:296). The ephemeral periphrases with the auxiliary in the gerund (5e) emerged in the seventeenth c. (Niculescu 2016:275), and those with the auxiliary in the infinitive (5f) emerged later (in the eighteenth c., probably replicating the pattern of the perfect subjunctive, Frâncu 2009:321).

(5) a au   cetitu   ce   era
        have.AUX.3SG read.PTCP   what be.AUX.3PL
        ei   scris
        they.NOM   write.PTCP
        'He read what they had written' (CC[1].1567:2ᵛ)

     b rugu-l   fusese   văzut   [pe   drac]
        briar=CL.ACC.3MSG   be.AUX.3SG   see.PTCP   DOM   devil
        'the briar had seen him (= the devil)' (CSᵥɪ.1590-602:60ʳ)

     c să   fim   noi iubit   pre   Dumnezeu
        SBJV   be.AUX.1PL   we love.PTCP   DOM   God
        'that we have loved God' (CC[1].1567:25ʳ)

     d se fure   faptu   păcatu, lăsa-   se-   va
        if be.AUX   do.PTCP   sin   forgive.INF= CL.REFL=   want.AUX.3SG
        lui
        him.DAT
        'if he sinned, he will be forgiven' (CV.1563-83:57ᵛ)

     e fiind   avut   cu   dânsul și   o căruță
        be.AUX   have.PTCP with him   also a carriage
        'having also had a carriage with him' (DC.a.1794:94)

     f vede-să   a   fi   trăit
        see.IND.PRES.3SG=CL.REFL   to   be.AUX   live.PTCP
        înaintea   lui   Lameh
        before   GEN   Lameh
        'he seems to have lived before Lameh' (ACT.1709:249)

There were also constructions with the auxiliary FI 'be' in an analytic form: the double compound past (6a), the future perfect (6b), the perfect conditional headed by the opaque auxiliary *aş* (6c) and its less frequent variant with the transparent auxiliary VREA 'want' (6d), as well as the double compound subjunctive (6e). We witness recurring patterns of formation, so that an analytic form can even have three auxiliary verbs: witness the compound perfect conditional (6f), the compound future perfect (6g), and the compound perfect conditional, built with the opaque *aş* (6h) and transparent VREA (6i) auxiliaries.

(6)   a   mulţi amu oameni   au   fost   fãcut
            many then people   have.AUX.3PL be.AUX   do.PTCP
            bunătăţi
            good.deeds
            'then many people had done good deeds' (CC².1581:44)

      b   lucrurile   ce   va   fi   lucrat
            things.DEF   which   want.AUX.3SG   be.AUX   complete.PTCP
            pre   ceastă lume
            in   this   world
            'the things he will have completed in this world' (CC².1581:120)

      c   de   n-ară   fi   pipăit,   n-ară
            if   not=AUX.COND.3SG   be.AUX   touch.PTCP   not=AUX.COND.3SG
            fi   nici   crezut
            be.AUX neither   believe.PTCP
            'If he had not touched it, he would not have even believed' (CC².1581:141)

      d   nu vrea   fi   tăcut   de   acesta
            not want.AUX.3SG   be.AUX   be.silent.PTCP of   this
            evanghelistul
            evangelist.DEF
            'the evangelist would not have kept silent about this' (CC².1581:267)

      e   să   fie   fost   trăit   într-însul
            SBJV   be.AUX.3SG   be.AUX   live.PTCP   in-him
            cu   pace (NL.~1750-66:3)
            with   peace
            'they should have lived in it (= the land) in peace'

      f   Pătru au   vrut   fi   zis
            Peter have.AUX.3SG   want.AUX   be.AUX say.PTCP
            'Peter would have said' (CC².1581:151)

      g   dă   se   va   fi   fãcut   sărutare,
            if   CL.REFL.PASS   want.AUX.3SG   be.AUX   do.PTCP   kiss
            ori   dă   nu să   va   fi   fost
            or   if   not CL.REFL.PASS   want.AUX.3SG   be.AUX be.AUX
            fãcut
            do.PTCP
            'if one had kissed or not' (Prav.1652:176)

      h   de-ară   fi   fost   înţelegut
            if=AUX.COND.3SG   be.AUX be.AUX   understand.PTCP
            'if he would have understood' (CPr.1566:287)

<table>
<tr><td>i</td><td>de vrea</td><td>fi</td><td>fost</td><td>iubit</td><td>acest</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>if want.AUX.3SG</td><td>be.AUX be.AUX</td><td></td><td>love.PTCP</td><td>this</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>tânăr pre</td><td>vecinul</td><td></td><td>său</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>young DOM</td><td>neighbour.DEF</td><td></td><td>his</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

'if this young man would have loved his neighbour' (CC^2.1581:323)

The future perfect was also used with a modal and evidential value as a perfect of the 'epistemic future', expressing suppositions about past events. The periphrasis with FI 'be' in the imperfect (i.e. the analytic pluperfect) was frequent in the sixteenth century (Pamfil 1973; Zamfir 2007:196-200). The periphrasis with the auxiliary in the compound past (*am fost* have.AUX.1SG be.AUX(PTCP) + PTCP), frequent until the eighteenth century (Pamfil 1973; Zamfir 2007:37-62) and preserved in the dialects to the present day (see §8.4.2 below), has been considered a second analytic pluperfect by some scholars (Densusianu 1938:224), but its uses were not always equivalent with those of an anaphoric 'past in the past'. It seems to have had a mainly aspectual value, emphasizing the perfectivity, as did the compound auxiliary forms (with the BE auxiliary) of Old Neapolitan, described by Ledgeway (2009:596-8)[13], corresponding therefore to the 'perfect in the past', according to the distinction in Squartini (1999). The periphrases with the auxiliary in the conditional (the synthetic *fure* (5d), the analytic *aş fi* (6c) / *vrea fi* (6d) or the double analytic *am vrut fi* (6f)) function as variants of the perfect conditional. The set of forms which contain three auxiliary verbs includes: the future perfect (*voi fi fost* + participle) (6g) (Zamfir 2007:258-9), the main perfect conditional (*aş fi fost* + participle) (6h) (Zamfir 2007:336, 339; Frâncu 2009:124) and also the type *vrea fi fost* + participle (6i), and the perfect subjunctive (*să fie fost* + participle) (6e), attested in old Romanian since the seventeenth century (Zamfir 2005:415; Frâncu 2010:121-3). Many of these formations ((6a), (6e), (6g), (6h), (6i)) contain FI 'be' in the past participle (i.e. *fost*), and this presumably contributes a supplementary degree of perfectivity, converted into pastness/anteriority.[14]

Only the analytic forms with the auxiliary in the imperfect, the compound past, the subjunctive, and the conditional were frequent in early texts. And only the perfect subjunctive ((i)c), ((ii)c), the future perfect ((i)a), ((ii)a), the conditional perfect ((i)b), ((ii)b), and the perfect infinitive ((i)c), ((ii)c) were retained (§8.3). In modern Romanian, these forms contain the invariable auxiliary FI 'be', which has two diachronic sources. With most of the forms, invariable FI 'be' originates from the bare infinitive form of 'be'. One the other hand, with the perfect subjunctive, it originates from an inflected form ('be' in the present subjunctive), which displayed variation in person and number ((i)d); later, in the nineteenth century, the inflexional endings were stripped off and the auxiliary became invariable by analogy with the other forms (the perfect conditional, the future perfect) where 'be' is invariable (see also example (34) and discussion in §8.5.1) ((ii)d). This change created a structural correspondence between the perfect subjunctive and the other analytic BE perfects, even if subjunctive *să* is an invariable particle, not an auxiliary.

---

[13] The same compound auxiliary pattern, but with the auxiliary HAVE, has been attested in Friulan, Occitan, French, Catalan, Raeto-Romance and northern Spanish varieties (Ledgeway 2009; Melchior 2012; De Saussure & Sthioul 2012). The French *surcomposé* forms, which are still in use, have different values in the informal register and in the regional varieties (see Carruthers 1994; Apothéloz 2010; Melchior 2012, i.a.).

[14] This raises important questions about the degree to which 'compositionality' plays a part in diachronic change (see Vincent 2015), that are worthwhile exploring in future work.

old Romanian

(i)   a.   *voi/ve(r)i/va/vom (v(r)em)/v(r)eți/vor*   *fi*   participle
      b.   *aș/ai/ar(ă)/am/ați/ar(ă)*   *fi*   participle
      c.   *a*   *fi*   participle
      d.   *să*   *fiu / fii / fie / fim / fiți / fie*   participle

modern Romanian

(ii) a.   *voi/vei/va/vom/veți/vor*   *fi* participle
      b.   *aș/ai/ar/am/ați/ar*   *fi* participle
      c.   *a*   *fi* participle
      d.   *să*   *fi* participle

The non-passive periphrases made up of BE plus past participle also underwent an important change: although in the sixteenth century this pattern frequently shows agreement, in the next centuries it appears without agreement (Dragomirescu 2014; 2016:263). Statistically, if the masculine singular forms are not considered (since it is impossible to say whether there is agreement or not) and we factor in the masculine plural and the feminine forms, then, in the sixteenth century, approximatively 50% of the periphrases made up of BE and the past participle show agreement (Dragomirescu 2016:264, 270). Notably, this form of gender and number agreement of the past participle with the subject does not depend on the class of the lexical verb; what is constant is the identity of the auxiliary: agreement shows up only in the BE-periphrases. Therefore, in contrast to most Romance varieties, transitive (7), unaccusative (8) and unergative (9) verbs show past participial agreement with the subject in BE-periphrases:

(7) a   Și   ceia   ce   vor   hi   fãcuți   aceasta
         and   those   what   want.AUX.3PL   be.AUX   do.PTCP.MPL   this.F.SG
         'and those who would have done that' (Prav.1581:258ʳ)
     b   și   ceia   ce   vor   fi   botezați
         and   those   who   want.AUX.3PL   be.AUX   christen.PTCP.MPL
         finul (Prav.1581:242ʳ)
         godson.DEF.ACC
         'and those who will have christened their godson'
(8) a   au   fost   trecuți   ai   de la Adamu
         have.AUX.3PL   be.AUX   pass.PTCP.MPL   years   from Adam
         până acmu   7105
         until now   7105
         '7105 years have passed from Adam until now' (DÎ.1597:XV)
     b   păscarii   era   ieșiți   dentr-însele,
         fishermen.DEF   be.AUX.3PL   go.out.PTCP.MPL   from-those
         spăla   mreaja
         wash.PRES.3PL   toils.DEF
         'the fishermen were out of there, they were washing the toils' (CC¹.1567: 110ᵛ)
(9) a   și încă foarte   departe   n-ară   fi   merși
         and yet very   far   not=AUX.COND.3PL   be.AUX   go.PTCP.MPL
         'and they would have not gone too far' (PO.1582:155)
     b   Că acești oameni   orbi   era   auziți
         that these people.MPL blind.MPL   be.AUX.3PL   hear.PTCP.MPL

de vestea
of news.DEF.ACC
'these blind people had heard the news' (CC[1].1567:55[v])

c   după   ce   era   lăcuiți   10   ani
        after   what   be.AUX.3PL   live.PTCP.MPL   ten   years
        în   pământul   Canaanului
        in   land.DEF   Canaan.GEN
        'after they lived for ten years in the land of Canaan' (PO.1582:52)

8.2.3 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the gerund/present participle

Old Romanian has a series of periphrases formed with auxiliary FI 'be' and the gerund, in parallel with the periphrases formed with the past participle just reviewed in §8.2.2. There are even isolated forms whose participle-based counterpart is not attested: with the auxiliary in the simple past (10c) (see also Zamfir 2007:75-6) and the imperative (10g). The original value of this pattern must have been the progressive one, even if the available textual evidence does not allow us to identify a clear aspectual contrast.

     The auxiliary exhibited a synthetic form in the present indicative (10a) (see also Zamfir 2007:74f.), the imperfect (10b), the simple past (10c), the pluperfect (10d), the subjunctive (10e) – which was attested since the seventeenth century (Zamfir 2005:415f.; Niculescu 2013:158) –, and the extremely rare synthetic conditional (10f) or the imperative (10g). The construction in (10h), with the invariable auxiliary FI 'be', is a late innovation (nineteenth century), whose emergence is probably due to analogy with the past participle periphrasis (see §8.2.2) (Niculescu 2013:166f.).

(10)   a   vor   chema   numele   lui Emmanuil,   carele
             want.AUX.3PL   call.INF   name.DEF   GEN Emmanuel   which.DEF
             iaste   tălmăcindu-se   „Cu   noi
             be.AUX.3SG   interpret.GER=CL.REFL.PASS   with   us.ACC
             Dumnezeu"
             God
             'they shall call his name Emmanuel, which means "God with us"' (BB.1688:751)

      b   În vreamea aceaia   era   Isusu   învăţându
             in time.DEF that   be.AUX.3SG   Jesus.NOM   teach.GER
             în besearecă   întru   o sâmbătă
             in church   in   a Saturday/Sabbath
             'Jesus was then teaching in a church on the Sabbath' (CC[2].1581:406)

      c   fum   veselindu-   nă
             be.AUX.1PL   be.glad.GER=   CL.ACC.1PL
             '(we) were glad' (PS.1573–8:273)

      d   patr-înşi-l   fusease   purtând
             four.people=CL.ACC.M.3SG   be.AUX.3PL   carry.GER
             'four people had carried him' (CC[2].1581:54)

      e   dă   vei   vedea   pe   vreun   păcătos […]
             if   want.AUX.3SG see.INF   DOM   any   sinner
             să   fie   petrecând   bine
             SBJV   be.AUX.3SG   feast.GER   well
             'if you see a sinner having a good time' (Prav.1652:613)

f   să fure   întru voi   lăcuind
      if be.AUX.2SG in   you.PL live.GER
      'if he lived in you' (CPr.1566:194)

g   fii   tocmindu-te[15]   cu
      be.AUX.2SG negociate.GER=CL.REFL.2SG with
      pârâșul tău (...)!
      your plaintiff
      'negotiate with your plaintiff' (BB.1688:753)

h   pare   a   nu mai   fi   existând   nici o
      seem.IND.PRES.3SG to   not more   be.AUX exist.GER   not one
      idee serioasă
      idea serious.FSG
      'it seems that there is no longer any serious idea' (EOXIII.1882:229)

Constructions are attested in which the auxiliary is itself an analytic form, occurring in the compound past (11a), the future (11b), the *aș*-conditional (11c), the VREA-conditional (11d), and the perfect subjunctive (11e). The most frequent was the analytic form with the auxiliary in the compound past (Zamfir 2007:62-74). Structures with three auxiliaries are also found, where the first auxiliary is itself an analytic form; these include a VREA 'want' conditional form (11f), a future perfect (11g) (cf. Zamfir 2007:258), and a conditional perfect (11h) (cf. Zamfir 2007:345).

(11) a   câți   draci   au   fost   av= av=având
           how.many   devil.PL   have.AUX.3SG be.AUX   have.GER
           întru   el
           inside   him
           'how many devils he had inside himself' (CC².1581:422)

     b   de vor   fi   şi   nescari nevoi   ţiind
           if want.AUX.3PL   be.AUX   also   some troubles   keep.GER
           pre   noi
           DOM   us
           'if any troubles will befall us' (CC².1581:306)

     c   de n-ați   fi   av= având   lucrure   bune
           if not=AUX.COND.2PL be.AUX   have.GER   thing.PL   good.PL
           'if you didn't have good things' (CC².1581:526)

     d   fi-vreați   știind
           be.AUX=want.AUX.2PL   know.GER
           'you would know' (CC².1581:526)

     e   varvarii […]   să   fie   fost   ţiind
           Barbarians.DEF   SBJV   be.AUX.3PL be.AUX   hold.GER
           'Barbarians should have held' (CH.1717-23:342)

     f.   am   vrut   fi   fiind
           have.AUX.1PL want.AUX   be.AUX   be.GER
           'we would be' (CT.1560–1:51ʳ)

---

[15] This structure is the unambiguous result of a loan translation from the Greek original, where the sequence ἴσθι εὐνοῶν is made up of the imperative of the verb BE and a present participle. Cf. https://biblehub.com/interlinear/matthew/5-25.htm [accessed on 12/21/2020].

g.	va	fi	fost	gătind	arme
	want.AUX.3SG	be.AUX	be.AUX	prepare.GER	weapons

'he will have prepared weapons' (Prav.1652:98)

h.	ară	fi	amu	fost	fiind
	AUX.COND.3SG	be.AUX	then	be.AUX	be.GER

'he would have been' (CPr.1566:553)

The functional value (mood and tense) of the progressive periphrases generally was the one supplied by their auxiliary, the periphrasis being equivalent to the present, the imperfect, the future, the conditional, etc. They gradually fell into disuse in the passage from old to modern Romanian. Contemporary Romanian preserves only the analytic forms which are the counterpart of the *fi*-perfects, i.e. the future (11b), the subjunctive (10e), the conditional (11c), and the infinitive (10h). These forms gradually specialized for specific epistemic uses of the future, the subjunctive, the conditional, the infinitive, but only the future periphrasis has a significant frequency and a certain degree of stability as a modal form (part of the so-called 'presumptive mood' – Zafiu 2013:53-3).

Particular hypotheses have been formulated for the disappearance of certain periphrases, including competition between functionally equivalent forms and bookish (learnèd) nature. For example, Frâncu (1983-84; 2014) suggests that the jettisoning of some older periphrases was determined by deliberate attempts to modernize the standard language in the nineteenth century (which is reflected also by their elimination from some influential grammars); also, they have been taken to be bookish (learnèd) forms, i.e. artificial forms with no real circulation. In §8.5 below, by contrast, we formulate an analysis which privileges structural factors as an explanation for the demise of these forms.

On the whole, the following features distinguish old Romanian analytic structures from those of modern Romanian:

- they are more numerous in previous stages of the language, but they have different frequencies which reflect different degrees of stability;
- those with the FI 'be' auxiliary are built on a pattern which allows for the recurrent extension of the structure;
- the auxiliary FI 'be' appears as inflected for tense (and aspect);
- the auxiliary FI 'be' is not restricted to irrealis forms, but also occurs with different tenses of the indicative.

8.3 Analytic forms in modern Romanian

The TAM system of modern standard Romanian has six synthetic forms: the present indicative, the simple past, the pluperfect indicative, the imperfect indicative, the present subjunctive, and the imperative. The analytic forms are the compound past, three competing paradigms with future value, the future perfect, the present and perfect conditional, the perfect subjunctive, the perfect infinitive, and three marginal periphrases (the presumptive periphrases) specialized for the epistemic values of the future, the subjunctive, and the conditional (see Zafiu 2013). Depending on the non-finite or finite form of the main verb, standard Romanian shows four types of analytic forms which use the infinitive, the past participle and the gerund (present participle), and the subjunctive, respectively.

The periphrases which use the infinitive are the *voi*-future (dubbed 'the literary future' in the Romanian grammatical tradition), which is also the oldest type of future, and the conditional. The auxiliary of the future (12a) preserves older forms (1sg *voi*, 3sg. *va*, 3pl *vor*) and simplified forms

(2sg *vei*, 1pl *vom*, 2pl *veți*) of the present tense of the verb VREA 'want', while the paradigm of the lexical verb has been analogically regularized on the model of the root in 1pl *vrem* and 2 pl *vreți* – witness the forms 1sg *vreau*, 2sg *vrei*, 3sg *vrea* (Maiden *et al* 2021:362-3). The conditional auxiliary (12b) has opaque forms which have generated etymological controversies: they present a certain similarity to forms of AVEA 'have', but almost certainly (according to an old explanation, revived in Zafiu 2017) derive from past forms of the same auxiliary 'want' (see also §8.2.1 above).

(12)   a   voi/vei/va/vom/veți/vor   merge
                want.AUX.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL go.INF
       b   aș/ai/ar/am/ați/ar   merge
                AUX.COND.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL   go.INF

The periphrases involving the past participle of the lexical verb are heterogeneous. The only pattern formed with the auxiliary AVEA 'have' is the compound past (13a). The other set of forms with a participial lexical verb are formed with the invariable auxiliary FI ('be'), interpreted as an irrealis auxiliary by Avram & Hill (2007) (see Ledgeway 2015 for a finer-grained distinction). In one set of constructions, i.e. in the perfect subjunctive (13b) and the perfect infinitive (13c), FI 'be' is preceded by invariable particles (*să* and *a*). In another set of forms, the first element in the cluster is a proper (inflected) auxiliary, i.e. the future auxiliary *voi* in the future perfect (13d) and the conditional auxiliary *aș* in the conditional perfect (13c).

(13)   a   am/ai/a/am/ați/au   mers
                have.AUX.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL go.PTCP
       b   să   fi   mers
                SBJV   be.AUX go.PTCP
       c   a   fi   mers
                to   be.AUX go.PTCP
       d   voi/vei/va/vom/veți/vor   fi   mers
                want.AUX.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL be.AUX go.PTCP
       e   aș/ai/ar/am/ați/ar   fi   mers
                AUX.COND.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL be.AUX go.PTCP

In fact, the aspectual difference between future and future perfect, and between present conditional and perfect conditional is reanalysed in contemporary Romanian as a difference between the present infinitive and the perfect infinitive (made up of the invariable auxiliary FI 'be' + past participle):[16]

(14)   a   voi   [merge]   vs.   voi   [fi   mers]
                want.AUX.1SG go.INF   want.AUX.1SG be.AUX   go.PTCP
       b   aș   [merge]   vs.   aș   [fi   mers]
                AUX.COND.1SG go.INF   AUX.COND.1SG be.AUX   go.PTCP

---

[16] The interpretation of the perfect conditional and of the perfect future as being made up of auxiliary (*aș* or *voi*) plus perfect infinitive is adopted, for example, in Avram (1999:40), D'Hulst, Coene & Avram (2004) and Nicolae (2015:82f.).

The subjunctive and the infinitive can be analysed along similar, yet not fully identical lines; although from an inflexional perspective, the opposition between the present subjunctive and the perfect subjunctive is not of the same type as that between the present infinitive and the perfect infinitive (the subjunctive displays an opposition between a variable/finite form in the present and an invariable/non-finite sequence in the perfect), from a distributional point of view the present subjunctive and the perfect subjunctive make up a minimal pair.

(15) a   a   [merge]   vs.   a   [fi   mers]
                  to   go.INF   to   be.AUX go.PTCP
        b   să   [merg]   vs.   să   [fi   mers]
                  SBJV go.SBJV.1SG   SBJV be.AUX go.PTCP

Periphrases with FI 'be' + gerund (present participle) are the perfect counterpart of the 'be' + past participle constructions. They are rare in present-day Romanian; only the construction with the future of the auxiliary (16a) is more frequent; it is specialized for the epistemic value of the future, partially grammaticalized as a form in the presumptive paradigm. The others, learnèd and extremely rare (almost extinct), are variants of the present subjunctive (16b), of the infinitive (16c), and of the present conditional (16d), specialized for expressing epistemic uses of the subjunctive, the infinitive, and the conditional, respectively.[17] The original progressive value of these periphrases (§8.2.3) has been lost, but there is an acknowledged diachronic relation between the progressive and epistemic values (Heine 1995; Anthonissen, De Wit & Mortelmans 2016; see Bertinetto 2000 for a particular view on Romance) which eventually paved the way for the reinterpretation of these periphrases as epistemic forms.

(16) a   (v)oi   fi   mergând
              want.AUX.2SG be.AUX   go.GER
        b   să   fi   mergând
              SBJV   be.AUX go.GER
        c   a   fi   mergând
              to   be.AUX go.GER
        d   aş   fi   mergând
              AUX.COND.1SG   be.AUX go.GER

This pattern can be interpreted as having the same segmentation (formal analysis) as the perfect series:

(17) a   (v)oi   [fi   mergând]   vs.   voi   [fi   mers]
              want.AUX.1SG be.AUX go.GER   want.AUX.1SG be.AUX go.PTCP
        b   să   [fi   mergând]   vs.   să   [fi   mers]
              SBJV   be.AUX go.GER   SBJV   be.AUX go.PTCP

---

[17] The label *presumptive mood* is inconsistently used in the literature, sometimes for the partly specialized Romanian epistemic future, which has three paradigms – present *oi fi* (want.AUX.1SG) be.AUX and *(v)oi fi fiind* (want.AUX.1SG be.AUX be.GER), perfect *(v)oi fi fost* (want.AUX.1SG be.AUX be.PTCP) (Zafiu 2013:53f.) – and at other times for all the gerund periphrases which have been preserved and specialized with an epistemic value (Niculescu 2013), and in some cases for specific combinations of these categories.

c	a	[fi	mergând]	vs.	a	[fi	mers]
	to	be.AUX	go.GER		to	be.AUX	go.PTCP
d.	aș	[fi	mergând]	vs.	aș	[fi	mers]
	AUX.COND.1SG	be.AUX	go.GER		AUX.COND.1SG	be.AUX	go.PTCP

Periphrases with the subjunctive of the lexical verb are more recent and reflect the phenomenon of replacement of the infinitive by the subjunctive, typical of the Balkan Sprachbund (cf. Sandfeld 1930). They are alternative paradigms of the future, only partially accepted by the standard language: one of them (18a) reflects a common Balkan pattern (invariable particle *o* (< *oa [wa] < *va* 'wants') + verb in the subjunctive). The type in (18b) is made up of the auxiliary HAVE + verb in the subjunctive. There is an important difference between the future in (12a) and the future in (18a): inflexion (in number and person) is marked on the auxiliary in the first case, but on the main verb in the second; (18b) features inflexion on both components.

(18)   a   o   să merg/mergi/meargă/mergem/mergeți/meargă (3PL also: or să meargă)
              PRT   SBJV go.SBJV.PRES.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL
        b   am/ai/are/avem/aveți/au   să
              have.IND.PRS.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL   SBJV
              merg/mergi/meargă/mergem/mergeți/meargă
              go.PRS.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL

The auxiliary in (18b) has the same forms as lexical HAVE; occurrence in actual usage is uneven, in that the 1pl and 2pl and 3sg are infrequent in comparison to the frequent 1sg, 2sg and 3pl (Berea-Găgeanu 1972). Modern Romanian uses a learnèd future in the past formed with the same auxiliary in the imperfect (19).

(19)   aveam/aveai/avea/aveam/aveai/aveau   să
        have.IND.IMPF.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL   SBJV
        merg/mergi/meargă/mergem/mergeți/meargă
        go.SBJV.PRS.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL

The analytic forms in (18) and (19) are not of the same structural type as the other (auxiliary-based) analytic structures introduced in this section, as the lexical verb is an inflected (not a non-finite) form; §8.5.2 takes up this issue in more detail.

For a classification of modern Romanian analytic forms, see Maiden et al. (2021:369-82); for a summary of the differences between Romanian and Western Romance, see D'Hulst, Coene & Avram (2004:362-5).

8.4 Analytic forms in the (Daco-)Romanian dialectal varieties

Besides the forms of standard (modern) Romanian, dialectal data reveal that certain periphrastic verb forms have been preserved.

8.4.1 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the infinitive

The analytic conditional with a 'transparent' auxiliary is preserved in a few isolated areas.
The pattern VREA 'want' in the imperfect + infinitive has been found in several areas of the dialect of Banat (20a) (Neagoe 1984:264), Crișana and Maramureș (20b) (Marin 2000:202). In

the south of Crişana, an area adjacent to Banat, there is an analytic conditional composed of an invariable third-person singular form of the auxiliary and the infinitive (20c) (Uriţescu 1984:310).

(20)   a   reaş   merge
            want.AUX.1SG go.INF
            'I would go'
       b   Urâtu   satului   ve   vorbi
            ugly.DEF   village.DEF.GEN   want.AUX.3SG speak.INF
            cu   Mândra   satului
            with   beautiful.DEF village.DEF.GEN
            'The village ugly would speak with the village beauty'
       c   vrę   mę   noi aclo
            want.AUX.1PL go.INF we there
            'We would go there'

    The pattern with the compound past of the auxiliary VREA 'want', rarely attested in old Romanian, is occasionally found in Crişana, Sălaj, and Maramureş (Marin 2000:202; Marin et al. 2017:47; cf. Uritescu 1984:310):

(21)   a   te-   ai   vu   supăra
            CL.REFL.2SG= have.AUX.2SG want.AUX   get.upset.INF
            'you would get upset'
       b   dacă   am   vrut   şti,   plecam
            if   have.AUX.1SG want.AUX   know.INF   leave.IND.IMPF.1SG
            'had I known, I would have left'

    The future consisting of the auxiliary AVEA 'have' with the same inflexion as the corresponding lexical verb and followed by an *a*-infinitive has been preserved in Bucovina and Maramureş (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:111).

(22)   a   n-   aveţi   a   mântui   repede   cu   mine
            not= have.AUX.2PL to   finish.INF   fast   with   me.ACC
            'You won't finish fast with me'
       b   unde   avem   a   durmi?
            where have.AUX.1PL to   sleep.INF
            'where are we going to sleep?'

8.4.2 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the past participle

The periphrasis with FI 'be' in the imperfect and a past participle showing agreement (of the same type as that of old Romanian, cf. (8b), (9c) in §8.2.2 above) survived in regional varieties in the west, the north, but also the south (Marin 1985:463; 2005-7:117-9):

(23)   nu   era   mutaţi   acasă la ei
        not   be.AUX.3PL   move.PTCP.MPL   home at them
        'they had not moved to their place'

The periphrasis with FI 'be' in the compound past is better preserved in non-standard Romanian, in all areas, even in the south (an area which shows the smallest degree of analyticity in the verbal domain) (Lăzărescu 1984:225; Marin 1985; 2005-07:119f.; Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998; Mărgărit & Neagoe 1997; Neagoe 1992a:83; 1992b:163; Uritescu 1984:309; Vulpe 1984:337). Its temporal value depends on the context: it can be interpreted either as a pluperfect, or as a compound past, depending on the context (cf. (24) from Neagoe 1992a:83), the latter reading actually confirming Ledgeway's (2009:598) observation that the Romance compound auxiliary forms are conditioned and optional variants of the correspondent simple (i.e. not compound) auxiliary forms.

(24)   a   apă   una am   fost   dat-   o
           then   one have.AUX.1SG   be.AUX   give.PTCP=   CL.ACC.F.3SG
           la muiere
           at wife
           'then I gave one to my wife'
      b   n-o   fo   avut   zăce   ani
           not=have.AUX.3SG   be.AUX   have.PTCP   ten   years
           'he wasn't ten years old yet'

Even the rare periphrases with FI 'be' in the pluperfect have some regional descendants in the south (Marin 1985:466; 2005-7:121):

(25)   Să   duce…   unde   fusese   Marin
       CL.REFL   go.IND.PRES.3SG   where   be.AUX.3SG   Marin
       tras
       pull.PTCP
       'He is going where Marin had spent the night'

The conditional perfect, *vreaș + fi* 'be'+ past participle, is still attested in the Valea Almăjului area (an isolated rural region in Banat) and in the north-western part of Oltenia (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:112):

(26)   parcă   mai   vreaș   fi   șezut   acolo
       seems   more   want.AUX.1SG   be.AUX   stay.PTCP   there
       'I would have kind of preferred to stay there longer'

The periphrastic form with FI 'be' in the subjunctive + past participle (with agreement)[18] was preserved in the north-western part of Oltenia, the west of Crișana and the Apuseni Mountains (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:112):

---

[18] It is not clear whether this is a genuine participle agreement or whether it preserves the archaic *-ă* invariable past participle ending in *-ă*, syncretic with the singular feminine form of the past participle (Uritescu 2007), also attested in the old language, in periphrastic forms with the auxiliary BE (Dragomirescu 2016: 269-70), extremely rarely with HAVE (Densusianu 1961 II:143).

(27) să   fie   fostă   moda
      SBJV   be.AUX.3SG   be.PTCP(.FSG) fashion
      'if that were the fashion'

8.4.3 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the gerund/present participle
The periphrasis with the auxiliary FI 'be' in the imperfect followed by the gerund of the lexical verb is rarely attested in the south (Marin 1985:459; 2005-07:115; 2012:20):

(28) […] erau   trecând   printr-o   pădure
           be.AUX.3PL   cross.GER   through-a   forest
      'they were crossing a forest'

    The periphrasis with the auxiliary FI 'be' in the compound past is preserved with a low frequency in Wallachia, Dobrodja, Oltenia, Banat, and several areas of Transylvania (Marin 1985; 2005-07:112-114; 2012; 2014; Neagoe 1984:263; 1992a:83; 1992b:163; Urițescu 1984:308; Vulpe 1984:336):

(29) ăst unchiaș   a   fost   având   un   fecior
      this old.man   have.AUX.3SG   be.AUX   have.GER   a   son
      'this old man had a son'

    An atypical construction involving the invariable auxiliary *o* and the gerund (30), which has the value of an imperfect or of a perfect, is attested in Banat (Neagoe 1984:263). The form of this construction can be explained by the loss of the past participle *fost* (from *o ~~fost~~ dând*); it was probably preserved by analogy with the past participle periphrases (*o (fost) dat*, cf., for example, (24)).

(30) o   dând
      have.AUX   give.GER
      'he was giving'

    The periphrases specialized for expressing the epistemic (presumptive) value are attested with the auxiliary in the future (31a) or in the conditional (31b), but, in contrast to standard Romanian, the gerund can have a 'feminine' form (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:113; see Maiden et al. 2021:340-1 for details with respect to this 'feminine' gerund).

(31) a.   nu știu   cum s-o   fi   făcândă
           not know.IND.PRS.1SG   how CL.REFL.PASS=PRT   be.AUX do.GER.FSG
           'I don't know how it would be made'
      b.   zicea   că   ar   fi   avândă
           say.IMPF.3SG that   AUX.COND.3SG   be.AUX have.GER.FSG
           'he was saying that he would be having'

8.5 An account of the partial loss of analyticity in Romanian verbal morphology
The aim of this section is to argue that the group of now defunct auxiliary-based forms share a set of properties which distinguishes them from the auxiliary-based forms which have been diachronically preserved.

On the one hand, we see that, on the surface, change is driven by a principle of inflexional simplification, which is, in turn, the effect of structural factors which have to do with the division of labour between the auxiliary verb and the lexical verb in the marking of T(ense)-A(spect)-M(ood) categories. In particular, we argue that the feature matrix of auxiliaries in the now defunct periphrases is richer and includes tense features along with mood features, while the auxiliaries of the forms which have been diachronically preserved have an impoverished feature matrix, devoid of tense features. In the latter periphrases, assuming a compositional analysis of TAM encoding (cf. Comrie 1985:76), the tense specification is provided by the morphology of the lexical verb; Romanian verbal participles have been analysed as encoding perfective aspective and past tense (Stati 1965:195; D'Hulst, Coene & Avram 2004:360, 364 i.a.); cf. also Comrie 1985:65ff on the featural make up of (verbal) participles). The idea that modern Romanian auxiliaries do not inflect for tense has been previously advanced by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), D'Hulst, Coene & Avram (2004) and Nicolae (2015).

On the other, we see that other analytic forms (some of them analytic but not periphrastic, see Ledgeway, Smith & Vincent, current volume) are not affected by the changes which act upon auxiliary-based structures, hence they are more stable diachronically, as they show distinct properties and a different division of labour in TAM marking (§8.5.2); should changes occur, these act upon the auxiliary/auxiliary sequence internal to them.

8.5.1 Demise of a subset of periphrastic forms
When comparing the now defunct forms with the forms which have been diachronically preserved, we observe that the former are more complex than the latter from an inflexional point of view. Thus, the inflexionally complex forms fall into several types according to the structure of the first auxiliary:

(a) forms whose BE or WANT auxiliary displays mood and tense inflection (32): BE occurs in the indicative present (32a), imperfect (32b), simple past (32c), pluperfect (32d), conditional/future (32e), present subjunctive (32f), and the imperative (32g), or as a non-finite form (a gerund) (32h); WANT occurs in the imperfect indicative (32i); and:

(b) forms whose BE or WANT auxiliary occurs as an analytic form (33), hence the periphrastic form is itself a compound periphrasis: BE in the compound past in (33a), WANT in the compound past in (33b).

(32)	a	iaste	tălmăcindu	(=(10a))
		be.AUX.3SG	interpret.GER	
	b₁	era	scris	(=(5a))
		be.AUX.3PL	write.PTCP	
	b₂	era	învăţându	(=(10b))
		be.AUX.3SG	teach.GER	
	c	fum	veselindu	(=(10c))
		be.AUX.1PL	be.glad.GER	
	d₁	fusese	văzut	(=(5b))
		be.AUX	see.PTCP	
	d₂	fusease	purtând	(=(10d))
		be.AUX.3PL	carry.GER	
	e₁	fure	faptu	(=(5d))
		be.AUX.3SG	do.PTCP	

	e₂	fure	lăcuind			(=(10f))
		be.AUX.3SG	live.GER			
	f₁	să	fim	iubit		(= (5c))
		SBJV	be.AUX.1PL	love.PTCP		
	f₂	să	fie	petrecând		(=(10e))
		SBJV	be.AUX.3SG	feast.GER		
	f₃	să	fie	fost	ţiind	(=(11e))
		SBJV	be.AUX.3SG	be.AUX	hold.GER	
	g	fii	tocmindu			(=(10g))
		be.AUX.2SG	negociate.GER			
	h	fiind	avut			(=(5e))
		be.AUX	have.PTCP			
	i₁	vrea	fi			(=(2b))
		want.AUX.3SG	be.INF			
	i₂	vrea	fi	tăcut		(=(6d))
		want.AUX.3SG	be.AUX	be.silent.PTCP		
	i₃	vrea	fi	fost	iubit	(=(6i))
		want.AUX.3SG	be.AUX	be.AUX	love.PTCP	
	i₄	fi-vreaţi	ştiind			(=(11d))
		be.AUX=want.AUX.2PL	know.GER			
(33)	a	au	fost	făcut		(=(6a))
		have.AUX.3PL	be.AUX	make.PTCP		
	b₁	au	vrut	vrea		(=(3))
		have.AUX.3PL	want.AUX	want.INF		
	b₂	au	vrut	fi	zis	(= (6f))
		have.AUX.3PL	want.AUX	be.AUX	say.PTCP	
	b₃	am	vrut	fi	fiind	(=(11f))
		have.AUX.1PL	want.AUX	be.AUX	be.GER	

Note that the WANT auxiliary (inflected for mood and tense or occurring as an analytic form) may be accompanied by a BE auxiliary, occurring as a bare infinitive or as a past participle, thereby giving rise to another variety of double (32i₂), (32i₄) and even triple (32i₃), (33b₂), (33b₃) compound periphrases.

In contrast to these now defunct forms, all the periphrastic forms which have been preserved are characterized by auxiliaries with a simpler inflexional structure: notably, what is absent from the feature composition of these auxiliaries is a tense specification. Thus, as proposed in Nicolae (2015; 2019) on the basis of older remarks by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), modern Romanian periphrastic structures appear to be oriented around the category of mood, encoded explicitly by the auxiliary verb; tense inflection is not present on the auxiliary. Emergent structures whose auxiliaries have a more complex structure encoding also tense (cf. (32) and (33)) are not diachronically preserved in the standard language.

This claim finds support in the compound auxiliary forms. With the double auxiliary forms preserved in modern Romanian – the conditional perfect and the future perfect (as well as their infrequently used gerundial counterparts, specialized for epistemic values) – we observe that the second auxiliary is the invariable FI 'be'. The preservation (and vitality) of these forms is extremely relevant for the diachronic process discussed here. First, it is relevant as it confirms the hypothesis that the elimination of a subset of auxiliary-based forms is not driven by reasons

which have to do with auxiliary selection (as one might be tempted to believe, given that many of the defunct forms are based on FI 'be'), since BE is preserved with these forms (as well as with the perfect subjunctive and with the perfect infinitive, see §8.5.2). Nor does it have to do with the disappearance of compound auxiliary forms – these periphrases contain two auxiliaries. Second, observe that this BE (interpreted as an irrealis auxiliary in these modern Romanian forms, see §8.3) occurs as an uninflected form, a form which in and of itself is unspecified for tense. This gives rise to yet another extremely relevant old/modern Romanian difference. Alongside these invariable BE forms (where the auxiliary is syncretic with the bare infinitive), we find in old Romanian forms in which the auxiliary BE occurs as a past participle (*fost*) (examples 6a, 6e, 6h, 6i, 11a, 11e, 11g, 11h); these past participle BE forms also disappeared, we believe, for a similar reason: as a past participle, BE is inflexionally complex and bears tense features (i.e. [past]), hence the periphrasis diachronically disappeared because it contained a tense-bearing auxiliary, even if BE is not the first auxiliary in the cluster. Below, we briefly address the division of labour in the marking of TAM categories, and we show that in modern Romanian compound auxiliary structures, both auxiliaries encode mood values. However, two more facts should be mentioned before discussing this in more detail.

First, from what has been said so far, it follows that some of the now defunct periphrases were subjected to a bi-directional pressure on their auxiliaries: with forms such as (6i) (= (32i₃) above), two of the three auxiliaries in the cluster (the highest, WANT in the imperfect, and the lowest, BE as past participle) explicitly marked tense, hence their loss was motivated on two accounts. Second, we see inflexional simplification at work from at least two other perspectives as well. On the one hand, participle agreement in non-passive structures (see the discussion of examples (7), (8), (9) in §8.2.2 above) disappears from the standard language across the board (Dragomirescu 2014), being preserved only occasionally in dialectal Romanian (see (23), (27)): it disappears both from structures where the BE auxiliary displays inflexion (as a synthetic form (9b) or as an analytic form (8a)), and from structures where BE occurs as an invariable auxiliary (7b), (9b).

On the other hand, we see forms such as the perfect or gerundial subjunctive, which in modern Romanian consists of the subjunctive particle *să* plus the invariable auxiliary BE plus the past participle/gerund, evolving from structures in which BE is originally inflected for the subjunctive, but gradually undergoes inflexional simplification losing the subjunctive marking and turning into an invariable auxiliary (cf. (34)).

(34) a   să   fim   noi   iubit   pre   Dumnezeu
            SBJV be.AUX.1PL we   love.PTCP   DOM   God
            'should we have loved God' (CC¹.1567:25ʳ)
      a'   să   fi   iubit   (modern Romanian)
            SBJV be.AUX love.PTCP
      b   pentru ca   să   fie   judecând   la tot norodul
            for   that SBJV be.AUX.PL   judge.GER   to all people.DEF
            'so they might be judging all the people' (BB.1688:340)
      b'   să   fi   judecând   (modern Romanian)
            SBJV be.AUX judge.GER

It is not clear if the disappearance of participle agreement and of subjunctive inflexion is directly related to the type of inflexional simplification which we have taken to explain the disappearance

of a subset of auxiliary-based forms, but it essentially reflects a tendency towards inflexional simplicity operating at a pace with other similar processes.

Returning now to the idea that the now defunct periphrases involved auxiliaries whose feature matrix was more complex than that of auxiliaries found in periphrastic forms which have survived, we briefly bring to the fore some supplementary evidence for the hypothesis that modern Romanian auxiliaries are mood oriented,[19] and comment on the division of labour between the auxiliary and the lexical verb in the marking of TAM categories.

First, the contrast between the periphrastic paradigms with auxiliary HAVE in (standard) French (35) and (standard) Romanian (36) shows that in French, but not in Romanian, the auxiliary overtly inflects for both tense and mood. By contrast, the Romanian periphrasis with the HAVE auxiliary is unambiguously indicative (and may have the functional value of a past punctual or a present perfect); the tense (and aspect) specification is provided by the morphology of the lexical verb (D'Hulst, Coene & Avram 2004:364):

(35) a j'ai mangé (French)
          I=have.AUX.IND.PRS.1SG eat.PTCP
      b j'avais mangé
          I=have.AUX.IND.IMPF.1SG eat.PTCP
      c j'aurai mangé
          I=have.AUX.FUT.1SG eat.PTCP
      d j'aurais mangé
          I=have.AUX.COND.PRES.1SG eat.PTCP
(36) eu am mâncat (Romanian)
      I have.AUX.1SG eat.PTCP

Second, the mood-oriented nature of Romanian auxiliaries can also be illustrated by the 'opacification' of the conditional auxiliary, a fact that could be related to the complete loss of its initial temporal value. The Romance conditional, considered as a separate mood or as a tense of indicative (Quer 2016), generally originates in a periphrastic future in the past (Ledgeway 2012:136), and has preserved some of the original temporal values and uses in addition to the novel modal and evidential ones. The Romanian conditional auxiliary most plausibly originates from a past form (an imperfect, probably contaminated by the simple past, Zafiu 2017) of the same auxiliary as the future (WANT), and probably went through the same process, moving from a future in the past value to the development of modal values. Relics of some temporal values of the *aș*-conditional can still be identified in the sixteenth century, but they rapidly disappear (see §8.2.1 supra). The present-day Romanian conditional-optative has two important features: an opaque auxiliary, whose relation to its etymon and with the future auxiliary is no longer visible[20], and a value which is no longer temporal, but only modal (Zafiu 2013: 50-3; Vlad 2012).

Third, minimal pairs like the following indicate that the entire periphrastic system of modern Romanian (except for the particle + subjunctive periphrases, see §8.5.2) is organized like this, with the auxiliary/auxiliaries primarily encoding mood values, and the lexical verbs enconding

---

[19] Cross-linguistically, it has been shown that auxiliaries may encode different TAM categories (Anderson 2006): tense, mood or aspect, as well as other linguistic categories. Therefore, the feature matrix of a given auxiliary needs to be identified for each language/structure in turn.

[20] The opaque nature of this auxiliary is reflected in the etymological debates which linked the modern forms to another auxiliary, AVEA 'have' (cf. Rosetti 1932:104; Elson 1992).

tense. In (37) the difference between the future and the future perfect is ensured by the distinction between the infinitive (37a) and the "perfect infinitive" (itself made up of irrealis BE plus a past participle, see also fnt. 16) (37b), not by the auxiliary *voi*.

(37) a   Voi   cânta.   (future)
            want.AUX.1SG sing.INF
            'I will sing.'
      b   Voi   fi   cântat.   (future perfect)
            want.AUX.1SG be.AUX   sing.PTCP
            'I will have sung.'

This becomes more evident with presumptive and epistemic conditional periphrases: the difference between a past vs a present/future orientation is solely conveyed by the difference between the gerund (present participle) (38a), (39a) and past participle (38b), (39b) encoded by the inflexional make up the lexical verb; the functional sequence which precedes the lexical verb is identical.

(38) a   O   fi   venind   <u>azi</u> /   <u>mâine</u> /   *<u>ieri</u>?
            PRT   be.AUX come.GER   today   tomorrow   yesterday
            'Could/Should (s)he be coming today/tomorrow?'
      b   O   fi   venit   *<u>mâine</u> /   <u>ieri</u>?
            PRT   be.AUX come.PTCP   tomorrow   yesterday
            'Could/Should (s)he has come? / Is it possible that (s)he came? / Did (s)he come?'
(39) a   Ar   fi   venind   (non-past)
            AUX.COND.3SG   be.AUX   come.GER
            '(S)he would come / be coming.'
      b   Ar   fi   venit   (perfect)
            AUX.COND.3SG   be.AUX   come.PTCP
            '(S)he would have come.'

Finally, it is important to highlight the fact that the presumptive – a set of periphrastic forms which, together with the conditional and the subjunctive, make up the class of irrealis moods – partially grammaticalized in Romanian.[21] It cannot be coincidental that a language with mood-oriented auxiliaries grammaticalized a periphrastic form with a primarily mood-oriented usage.

To conclude, the auxiliary system of modern Romanian appears to be mood-oriented, while the extinct auxiliary structures explicitly marked both mood and tense, therefore not conforming to the mood-oriented periphrastic pattern which diachronically prevailed to modern Romanian[22].

---

[21] While the presumptive is traditionally claimed to be a so-called Balkan feature that is found in many of the languages of the Balkan area (see Friedman's 1986 discussion of the Bulgarian, Macedonian and Albanian presumptive), the particular forms discussed here (the so-called Romanian presumptive) are more similar to the Romance epistemic future, both from the point of view of their values, and from the point of view origin (see Squartini 2005).

[22] Note that, according to a long line of generative scholarship (see, for example, Cornilescu 2000; Schifano 2018), finite synthetic verb forms systematically raise to the mood head in modern Romanian. Nicolae (*in press*) develops this hypothesis in more detail.

8.5.2 Diachronically stable analytic formations

Of the forms introduced in §8.3 above, there is a set of diachronically stable analytic forms which might appear problematic for the mood-based explanation proposed in the previous section, but are not, as their internal structure is different from that of auxiliary-based forms.

The colloquial future made up of the particle *o* + the subjunctive, the colloquial future made up of fully inflecting HAVE + the subjunctive (40a) and the future consisting of the imperfect of HAVE + the subjunctive (40b) are not auxiliary-based forms of the same type as the periphrastic formations discussed above. In contrast to the typical auxiliary-based forms, which are characterized by obligatory clitic climbing and a single negator, with these subjunctive-based periphrases pronominal object clitics remain within the domain of the subjunctive verb (40) and negation may also marginally adjoin to the subjunctive (41); note that Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) and Avram (1999) argue that the HAVE + the subjunctive configuration (40a) is subject to a biclausal analysis.

(40) a o / am să- l
         PRT   have.PRS.1SG SBJV= CL.ACC.3MSG
         ascult.
         listen.PRS.SBJV.1SG
         'I will listen to him.'

      b aveam să- l ascult.
         have.IMPF.IND.1SG SBJV= CL.ACC.3MSG listen.SBJV.PRS.1SG
         'I was going to listen to him.'

(41) nu o / am / aveam să
      not PRT   have.IND.PRS.1SG   have.IND.IMPF.1SG SBJV
      (?nu) ascult.
      not listen.SBJV.PRS.1SG
      'I will not listen / I wasn't going to listen.'

The perfect subjunctive and perfect infinitive (42) are not problematic either, due to the cluster-internal distribution of functional elements. In contrast to auxiliaries, the formatives *a* and *să* occur to the left of clitics and the clausal negator and have been analysed as occurring in the complementizer domain (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Alboiu and Motopanyane 2000; Gheorghe 2013; Nicolae 2015:§III). Hence, for these forms, the division of labour in the marking of TAM is shared between the complementizer domain and the inflexional domain; besides the lexical verb, the sole other component internal to the inflexional domain is a mood marker – the invariable auxiliary BE, the exponent of irrealis (just like in the case of perfect conditional, future perfect, and gerundial epistemic periphrases) –, a fact which ensures the diachronic stability of the periphrases.

(42) să / a nu îl fi văzut
      SBJV   to not CL.ACC.M.3SG be.AUX see.PTCP
      '(s)he should/to not have seen him'

By contrast, periphrases like the double compound perfect subjunctive become diachronically extinct for the same reason as the group auxiliary-based forms discussed in the previous section: one of their auxiliaries is the past participle form of BE, an overt bearer of tense features.

(43) Află-să   această țară   să   fie
discover.IND.PRES.3SG=CL.REFL.PASS this   country SBJV   be.AUX.3SG
fostu   lăcuit   şi   alţii   într-însa
be.AUX   live.PTCP   also   others in=it
mai nainte   de noi (ULM.~1725:3^v)
before   of us
'one may discover that in this country others had lived before us'

8.5.3 The relevance of analytic formations which were preserved dialectally

The dialectal data presented in §8.4 appear to challenge our analysis. However, if we pay attention to the details related to the usage of these verbal periphrases, we notice that most of them are very rarely attested or attested in very isolated areas; our analysis has focused on the standard language, therefore the dialectal data do not challenge the analysis, as they are not part of the same variety. The only periphrasis which continues in many areas and has a considerable frequency is the one illustrated in (24), the *am fost dat* type (44a). The contrast in (44) shows that in this particular periphrasis (44a), the auxiliary AVEA 'have' still exclusively expresses mood, the tense-aspect value being expressed by the second part of the structure (*fost* + past participle).

(44)   a.   am   [fost   dat]   vs
                  have.AUX.1SG be.AUX   give.PTCP
       b.   am   [dat]
                  have.AUX.1SG give.PTCP

8.6 Conclusions: the loss of analyticity in a wider perspective

On the basis of the empirical data analysed in the paper, it has been observed that Romanian privileges mood: auxiliaries systematically grammaticalize as exponents of mood, and this has consequences for their internal structure and for the periphrases they are part of. Periphrases with auxiliaries whose feature matrix is richer and also includes tense features fail to enter the periphrastic system of standard Romanian (and, in some cases, give way to functionally equivalent synthetic formations). Anna Giacalone Ramat's (2000:125) remark that 'members of the category "auxiliary" exhibit differences in their degree of grammaticalization and are located at different points along the "Verb-to-TAM" chain' is thus highly relevant in this respect.

Another consequence of our analysis is that, besides the fact that some synthetic formations prevail over functionally equivalent periphrastic formations (whose internal structure does not observe the mood-oriented option), given the mood-oriented nature of the Romanian system, there are values which simply fail to get an exponent; this is the situation of the progressive, gerund-based periphrases, whose sole relics in modern Romanian are the gerundial presumptive and the very limited subjunctive and conditional gerundial periphrases.

goes to our colleague Ionuț Geană, who read the first draft of the paper, and made many substantive and stylistic suggestions.

Corpus

ACT.1709	Antim Ivireanul, *Chipurile Vechiului şi Noului Testament*. Ed.: Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ştrempel, Bucharest: Minerva, 1972, 240-321.
BB.1688	*Biblia*. Ed.: *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament*, tipărită întâia oară la 1688 în timpul lui Şerban Vodă Cantacuzino, Domnul Ţării Româneşti, Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic, 1977.
CC¹.1567	Coresi, *Tâlcul Evangheliilor*. Ed.: Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor şi molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1998, 31-187.
CC².1581	Coresi, *Evanghelie cu învăţătură*. Ed. S. Puşcariu, Al. Procopovici: Diaconul Coresi, *Carte cu învăţătură (1581)*, vol. I, *Textul*, Bucharest: Socec, 1914.
CH.1717-23	Dimitrie Cantemir, *Hronicul vechimei a romano moldo-vlahilor*, ed. S. Toma, Bucharest: Minerva, 1999−2000, 1-274 (vol. I), 5-223 (vol. II).
CPr.1566	Coresi, *Apostol*. Ed. I. Bianu, *Texte de limbă din secolul XVI, IV, Lucrul apostolesc tipărit de diaconul Coresi la 1563*, Bucharest: Cultura Naţională, 1930.
CS	*Codex Sturdzanus*. Ed. Gh. Chivu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1993, 237-300. CSᵥɪ.1590-602 – *Legenda lui Sisinie*.
CT.1560-1	Coresi, *Tetraevanghel*. Ed.: *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi. Braşov 1560–1561*, comparat cu *Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Măniceşti. 1574*, ed. F. Dimitrescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1963.
CV.1563-83	*Codicele Voroneţean*. Ed. M. Costinescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1981, 229-400.
DC.a.1794	*Departamentul de cremenalion. Din activitatea unei instanţe penale muntene (1794-1795)*. Ed. L. Livadă-Cadeschi, L. Vlad, Bucharest: Nemira, 2002 (Anaforaua postelnicului Gheorghe Berindei [...], a. 1794, 92-95]
DÎ	*Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea*, text stabilit şi indice de Gh. Chivu, M. Georgescu, M. Ioniţă, Al. Mareş, Al. Roman-Moraru, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1979.
EOXIII.1882	M. Eminescu, *Opere*, XIII. *Publicistică* (1882-1883, 1888-1889). Ed. A. Oprea, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1985.
NL.~1750-66	Ion Neculce, *Letopiseţul*. Ed.: Ion Neculce, *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei şi O samă de cuvinte*, ed. I. Iordan, Bucharest: Editura de Stat pentru Literatură şi Artă, ed. a II-a, 1959, 31-388.
PO.1582	*Palia de la Orăştie*. Ed. V. Pamfil, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1968.
Prav.1581	*Pravila ritorului Lucaci*. Ed. I. Rizescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1971, 161-83.
Prav.1652	*Îndreptarea legii*. 1652, ed. Colectivul pentru vechiul drept românesc condus de acad. A. Rădulescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1962 (*Adunarea izvoarelor vechiului drept românesc scris*, 7), 33-631.

ULM.~1725   Grigore Ureche, *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei*. Ed. P.P. Panaitescu, Bucharest: Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, 1955, 57-210.

References

Alboiu, Gabriela & Virginia Motapanyane (2000). 'The Generative Approach to Romanian Grammar: An Overview', in Virginia Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1-48.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. (2006). *Auxiliary Verb Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anthonissen, Lynn, Astrid De Wit & Tanja Mortelmans (2016). 'Aspect meets modality: A semantic analysis of the German *am*-progressive, *Journal of Germanic Linguistics,* 28(1), 1-30.

Apothéloz, Denis (2010). 'Le passé surcomposé et la valeur de parfait existentiel', *Journal of French Language Studies* 20 (2):105-26.

Arvinte, Vasile (1993). 'Construcţii perifrastice în Biblia de la București (1688), în ms. 45 și ms. 4389', *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 44 (3):177-81.

Avram, Larisa (1999). *Auxiliaries and the Structure of Language*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din București.

Avram, Larisa, & Virginia Hill (2007). 'An irrealis BE auxiliary in Romanian', in Raul Aranovich (ed.), *Split Auxiliary Systems: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 47-64.

Ayres-Bennett, Wendy & Janice Carruthers (1992). '«Une regrettable et fort disgracieuse faute de français»?: the description and analysis of the French *surcomposés* from 1530 to the present day', *Transactions of the Philological Socieiy* 90 (2):219-57.

Berea-Găgeanu, Elena (1972). 'Observaţii privind structura și evoluţia viitorului în limba română', *Limba română* 21(6):503-15.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco (2000). 'The progressive in Romance, as compared with English', in Östen Dahl (ed.), *Eurotyp Volume 6: Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 559-604.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca (1994). *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Caragiu-Marioţeanu, Matilda (1969). 'Verbul', in Ion Coteanu (ed.), *Istoria limbii române*, vol. II, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 254-78.

Carruthers, Janice (1994). 'The *passé surcomposé régional*: towards a definition of its function in contemporary spoken French', *Journal of French Language Studies* 4:171-90.

Comrie, Bernard (1976). *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard (1985). *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cornilescu, Alexandra (2000). 'The double subject construction in Romanian', in Virginia Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 83-133.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1987). 'Le latin vulgaire et le type linguistique roman (A propos de la thèse de Humboldt: "Es sanken Formen, nicht aber die Form")', in József Herman (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif. Actes du Ier colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2–5 septembre 1985)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 53-64.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1988). 'Der romanische Sprachtypus: Versuch einer neuen Typologisierung der romanischen Sprachen', in Jörn Albrecht (ed.), *Energeia und Ergon: Sprachliche*

Variation, Sprachgeschichte, Sprachtypologie. Band I, Schriften von Eugenio Coşeriu (1965-1987). Tübingen: Narr, 207-24.

D'Hulst, Yves, Coene, Martine & Avram, Larisa (2004). 'Syncretic and Analytic Tenses in Romanian. The Balkan Setting of Romance', in Olga Mišeska Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 355–74.

De Saussure, Louis & Bertrand Sthioul (2012). 'The Surcomposé Past Tense', in Robert I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 586-610.

Densusianu, Ovid (1938). *Histoire de la langue roumaine*. II. *Le seizième siècle.* Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1994). *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dragomirescu, Adina (2014). 'L'accord du participe passé en ancien roumain', *Linguistica Atlantica* 33 (2):38-51.

Dragomirescu, Adina (2016). 'The past participle and the participial clause', in Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 259-70.

Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae (2013). 'Urme ale selecției auxiliarului de perfect compus în română', in Oana Balaş & Coman Lupu (eds), *Hommages offerts à Florica Dimitrescu et Alexandru Niculescu.* Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 340-55.

Elson, Mark J. (1992). 'A Latin source for the conditional auxiliary in Romanian', *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 108:360-75.

Frâncu, Constantin (1970). 'Conjunctivul perfect românesc, privire diacronică', *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* 21 (2):205-24.

Frâncu, Constantin (1983-4). 'Geneza și evoluția timpurilor verbale supracompuse în limba română', *Anuar de lingvistică şi istorie literară* 29:23-62.

Frâncu, Constantin (2009). *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521-1780).* Iaşi: Demiurg.

Frâncu, Constantin (2010). *Conjunctivul românesc şi raporturile lui cu alte moduri*. Iaşi: Demiurg Plus.

Frâncu, Constantin (2012), 'Despre formele verbale supracompuse de tipul *am fost cântat, am fost cântând*', *Analele Universității 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza' din Iaşi, Secţiunea III, Lingvistică* 58:115-25.

Frâncu, Constantin (2014). 'Despre unele forme supracompuse', in Gheorghe Chivu & Oana Uţă Bărbulescu (eds), *Ion Coteanu—in memoriam.* Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 145-56.

Friedman, Victor A. (1986). 'Evidentiality in the Balkans: Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Albanian', in Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 168-87.

Gheorghe, Mihaela (2013). 'The structure of complex clauses: Subordination. Argument clauses', in Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 466-73.

Giacalone Ramat, Anna (2000). 'On some grammaticalization patterns for auxiliaries', in John Charles Smith & Delia Bentley (eds), *Historical Linguistics 1995: selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995. V.1. General Issues and Non-Germanic Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 125-54.

Heine, Bernd (1995). 'Agent-oriented vs. epistemic modality: some observations on German modals', in Joan Bybee & Suzanne Fleischman (eds), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 17-53.

Ivănescu, Gheorghe (1980/2000). *Istoria limbii române*. Iași: Junimea.

Kuteva, Tania (2001). *Auxiliation: An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lăzărescu, Paul (1984). 'Subdialectul moldovean', in: Rusu (ed.), 208-40.

Ledgeway, Adam (2009). *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ledgeway, Adam (2012). *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam (2015). 'Romance auxiliary selection in light of Romanian evidence', in Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula, Alexandru Nicolae & Louise Esher (eds), *Diachronic Variation in Romanian.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 3-34.

Ledgeway, Adam (2017). 'Syntheticity and Analyticity', in Andreas Dufter & Elisabeth Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax* (*Manuals of Romance Linguistics)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 837-84.

Maiden, Martin (2018). *The Romance Verb. Morphomic Structure and Diachrony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maiden, Martin, Adina Dragomirescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Oana Uță Bărbulescu & Rodica Zafiu (2021). *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Manoliu, Maria (1959). 'Une déviation du système de conjugaison romane: temps composés avec *a fi* "être" à la diathèse active en roumain', in *Recueil d'études romanes publiées à l'occasion du IXe Congrès International de Linguistique Romane à Lisbonne du 31 mars au 3 avril 1959.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 135-41.

Mărgărit, Iulia & Victorela Neagoe (1997). 'Cercetări asupra graiurilor românești din nord-estul Bulgariei (regiunea Loveci)', *Fonetică și dialectologie* 16:75-96.

Marin Maria (1985). 'Formes verbales périphrastiques de l'indicatif dans les parlers dacoroumains', *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 30 (5):459-68.

Marin, Maria (2000). 'Elemente arhaice sau învechite în morfosintaxa graiurilor românești din Ungaria', *Fonetică și dialectologie* 19:197-210.

Marin, Maria (2005-2007). 'Timpurile indicativului în graiurile dacoromâne actuale (II)'. *Fonetică și dialectologie* 24-26:89-164.

Marin, Maria (2012). 'Din nou despre unele forme verbale perifrastice', *Fonetică și dialectologie* XXXI:20-24.

Marin, Maria (2014). 'Trăsături dialectale comune graiurilor muntenești și celor crișene', *Fonetică și dialectologie* 33:87-98.

Marin, Maria et al. (2017). *Graiurile din Sălaj*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Marin, Maria, Iulia Mărgărit & Victorela Neagoe (1998). 'Graiuri românești din Ucraina și Republica Moldova', *Fonetică și dialectologie* 17:69-156.

Markopoulos, Theodore (2009). *The Future in Greek. From Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Melchior, Luca (2012). 'Tra esperienzialità e iteratività: il "passé surcomposé à valeur spéciale" in francese (e in altri idiomi romanzi)', *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 76:65-98.

Neagoe, Victorela (1984). 'Subdialectul bănățean', in Rusu (ed.), 240-84.

Neagoe, Victorela (1992a). 'Considerații cu privire la poziția graiului din Ținutul Pădurenilor (Hunedoara) în ansamblul dacoromânei', *Fonetică și dialectologie* 11:77-86.

Neagoe, Victorela (1992b). 'Aspecte ale morfosintaxei graiului din Țara Moților', *Fonetică și dialectologie* 11:161-67.

Nicolae, Alexandru (2015). *Ordinea constituenților în limba română. O perspectivă diacronică.* Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

Nicolae, Alexandru (2019). *Word Order and Parameter Change in Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nicolae, Alexandru (*in press*). 'Grammaticalization as pattern formation: Romanian auxiliaries from a diachronic Romance perspective', *Revue roumaine de linguistique* (to appear).

Nicula, Irina (2013). 'The gerund (present participle)', in Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 245-53.

Niculescu, Dana (2013). *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române din perspectivă tipologică. Gerunziul.* Bucharest: Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.

Niculescu, Dana (2016). 'The gerund and the gerundial construction', in Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 271-87.

Palmer, Frank R. (2001). *Mood and Modality*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pamfil, Viorica (1973). 'Formele de trecut indicativ în limba română din secolul al XVI-lea și frecvența lor', *Cercetări de lingvistică* 18 (2):205-16.

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

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.) (2016). *The Syntax of Old Romanian.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Philippide, Alexandru (1927). *Originea românilor*, II. Iași: Tipografia Viața Românească.

Quer, Josep (2016). 'Mood', in Adam Ledgeway, and Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to Romance Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 954-66.

Rosetti, Alexandru (1932). *Limba română în secolul al XVI-lea.* Bucharest: Cartea Românească.

Rusu, Valeriu (ed.) (1984). *Tratat de dialectologie românească.* Craiova: Scrisul Românesc.

Sandfeld, Kristian (1930). *Linguistique balkanique.* Paris: Champion.

Schifano, Norma (2018). *Verb Movement in Romance: A Comparative Study.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm von (1818). *Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales.* Paris: Librairie grecque-latine-allemande.

Schwegler, Armin (1990). *Analyticity and Syntheticity. A Diachronic Perspective with Special Reference to Romance Languages*. Berlin-New York: Mouton.

Squartini, Mario (1998). *Verbal Periphrases in Romance: Aspect, Actionality, and Grammaticalization*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Squartini, Mario (1999). 'On the semantics of the Pluperfect: Evidence from Germanic and Romance', *Linguistic Typology* 3 (1):51-90.

Squartini, Mario (2005). 'L'evidenzialità in rumeno e nelle altre lingue romanze', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 121:246-68.

Stati, Sorin (1965). 'Verbul', in *Istoria limbii române*, vol. I, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 166-97.

Timotin, Emanuela (2016). 'Presenting the corpus: typologizing, dating, and locating the texts', in Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 1-7.

Urițescu, Dorin (1984). 'Subdialectul crișean', in Rusu (ed.), 284-320.

Uritescu, Dorin (2007). 'Dans la perspective de l'Atlas de Crișana (I). Le participe passé daco-roumain en *-ă: mite roumain ou innovation d'une langue romane?*', in Sanda Reinheimer Rîpeanu & Ioana Vintilă-Rădulescu (eds), *Limba română, limbă romanică. Omagiu acad. Marius Sala la împlinirea a 75 de ani.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 555-66.

Vincent, Nigel (2015). 'Compositionality and change', in Claire Bowern & Bethwyn Evans (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Oxon, New York: Routledge, 103-23.

Vlad, Daciana (2012). 'Le conditionnel en roumain: une forme modale', *Faits de langues* 40:61-68.

Vulpe, Magdalena (1984). 'Subdialectul maramureşean', in Rusu (ed.), 320-54.

Weigand, Gustav (1896). 'Die Bildung des Imperfecti Futuri – Konditionalis, Optativi – im Rumänischen', *Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig* 3:139-61.

Zafiu, Rodica (2013). 'Mood, tense, and aspect', in Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 24-64.

Zafiu, Rodica (2016). 'The syntax of moods and tenses', in Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 14-52.

Zafiu, Rodica (2017). 'The auxiliary of the Romanian conditional: semantic and functional arguments concerning the reconstruction of a disputed grammaticalization process', *Diacronia* 6:1-20.

Zamfir, Dana-Mihaela (2005). *Morfologia verbului în dacoromâna veche (secolele al XVI-lea-al XVII-lea)*, vol. 1. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Zamfir, Dana-Mihaela (2007). *Morfologia verbului în dacoromâna veche (secolele al XVI-lea-al XVII-lea)*, vol. 2. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.