

Adina Dragomirescu and Alexandru Nicolae

The multiple grammaticalization of Romanian *veni* ‘come’. Focusing on the passive construction

1 Introduction¹

In Romanian, as in many other languages, the verb ‘come’ (Rom. *veni*) is polysemous, having multiple (related) meanings as well as various grammatical values. It is used as a passive auxiliary (1) and as a copula (2) in spoken contemporary Romanian, and as an inceptive verb (3) in standard Romanian.

- (1) *Casa aceea vine așezată aici.*
house.DEF that.F.SG comes placed.PPLE.F.SG here
‘The house is placed / will be placed / should be placed here.’
- (2) *Ion îmi vine cumnat.*
John CL.1.SG.DAT comes brother-in-law
‘John is my brother-in-law.’
- (3) *Îmi vine să plâng.*
CL.1.SG.DAT (it)comes SUBJ cry.SUBJ.1.SG
‘I feel like crying.’

Besides the presence of *veni* itself, these constructions have in common the loss of the genuine semantics of *veni* as a motion verb (with different degrees of semantic bleaching) while preserving an abstract dynamic meaning (see also Squartini 1999, 2003 for It. *venire*; for a different interpretation, see Giacalone Ramat and Sansò, this volume). Additionally, in (1) and (2) *veni* has lost its argument structure. These two properties indicate that *veni* has changed its status

¹ We would like to thank to Adam Ledgeway (Cambridge), Jenneke van der Wal (Cambridge), Andrea Sansò (Pavia), and Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (Bucharest) who read our paper and made very useful suggestions. We are also indebted to the participants at the workshop “Come and go off the beaten grammaticalization path”, organised by Maud Devos and Jenneke van der Wal within the 44th SLE meeting (Logroño, 2011). Remaining errors or inconsistencies are all ours.

(in (1) and (2) more conspicuously), from a lexical verb to a functional / semi-lexical element, a change which corresponds to a widely accepted generative view on grammaticalization, namely the idea that grammaticalization is upward movement on the clausal spine from the lexical area to the functional domain (Roberts and Roussou 2003: 20, 36, 194).

From a typological perspective, in connection with the neccessive value of motion verbs (see Bourdin, this volume), it is interesting to mention the existence in Old Romanian of a deontic modal usage of the verb *veni*, which is most probably an effect of Slavic influence:

- (4) *Pentr-aceea șerbul tău le țâne,*
 for that slave.DEF your CL.3PL.F.ACC keeps
păzându-le întregi, cum să vine.
 preserving=CL.3.PL.F.ACC intact how CL.REFL.ACC comes
 'For this reason, your slave keeps them, preserving them intact, as one
 should do it.' (Dosoftei, *Psaltirea*)

Starting from these data (presented in more detail in Section 2), the goal of this paper is to answer the following questions:

- (i) Given that in Romanian there are several verbs expressing the endpoint of motion (*veni*, *ajunge*, *sosi* 'come, arrive'), why is it that *veni*, and not other apparently synonymous verbs, grammaticalized in these constructions? How did the lexical semantics and syntax of *veni* influence this multiple-output grammaticalization?
- (ii) Does the grammaticalization of *veni* represent a shift in meaning (of the type metaphor, metonymy, etc.) and/or an instance of re-analysis (triggered by a specific distributional context)? How important is the (narrow distributional) context in this process? How did the original meaning of *veni* influence the semantics of the *veni*-passive construction?
- (iii) Given that some of these constructions are also attested in Latin (with *venire*) and that there are parallel developments in Romance, what is the contribution of the Latin heritage to the existence of this broad range of structures involving Rom. *veni*?
- (iv) Is it the case that language contact may have contributed to the emergence of some of the constructions above?
- (v) Finally, do the Romanian data illustrate a single grammaticalization path (with cascade effects) or do they illustrate independent grammaticalization processes?

In this paper, we will focus on the passive construction. However, we will bring into discussion the other constructions illustrated above when they contribute new evidence for this multiple grammaticalization puzzle.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2, we present in more detail the Romanian data for each of the four constructions, focussing on the passive construction, which appears in three different varieties of Romanian; in Section 3, we answer the questions above, analyzing the possible factors that have led to the grammaticalization of *veni*. In Section 4, we briefly summarize the results of our research on Romanian *veni* and their contribution to the grammaticalization of motion verbs in general.

2 The Romanian data

As shown in the introduction, in Romanian the verb *veni* ‘come’ grammaticalized in at least three different constructions. In this section, we will present in detail the *veni*-passive and we will offer more data for the other patterns.

2.1 Romanian *veni* as a passive auxiliary

Alongside the typical passive constructions with the auxiliary *fi* ‘be’ (5a) and with the *se*-reflexive passive (5b), in Romanian there is a passive construction in which *veni* (‘come’) is used as an auxiliary verb (mentioned in Jordan 1950; Manoliu 1971; *Tratat* 1984: 181; Pană Dindelegan 2003, 2008b). This *veni*-passive construction occurs in two different styles: (i) it occurs in the popular, oral language ((1), (6a)), and (ii) it occurs in written, high-style texts, an instance where it is considered to be a loan translation from Italian (6b). This structure also exists in the Istro-Romanian dialect / language, where it was claimed to be the outcome of direct contact with Italian (6c) (see Section 2.1.3 for details).

- (5) a. *Copiii sunt lăudați de părinți.*
 children.DEF are praised by parents
 ‘Children are praised by their parents.’
- b. *Se cumpără multe cadouri de Crăciun.*
 CL.REFL.PASS buys many gifts on Christmas
 ‘One buys many gifts for Christmas.’

- (6) a. *Celălalt bec vine slăbit.* (in Iordan 1950: 277)
 the.other bulb comes loosened
 ‘The other bulb *must be loosened.*’
- b. [...] *construzione sau alcătuire care dă Greci vine*
 construction or making which by Greeks comes
numită sintaxis
 name.PPLE.F.SG syntax
 ‘[...] construction or making which *was / is named* syntax by the Greeks’
 (Ienache Văcărescu, *Gramatica*, 1787) – cf. It. *viene chiamata*
- c. *văca virit-a utise* (in *Tratat* 1984: 577)
 COW.DEF come-has killed
 ‘the cow *was killed*’

We will next discuss in turn these contexts, which are of a great stylistic and dialectal diversity.

2.1.1 The *veni*-passive in the popular, oral language

The existence of a passive construction which uses the auxiliary *veni* instead of *fi* (‘be’) in some areas of Romania (the south-eastern area of Buzău, and the southern area of Oltenia) has been noticed by Iordan (1950: 277–279), who mentions a few examples from spoken Daco-Romanian (the main dialect of Romanian), given in (7). The *veni*-passive is also attested in literary writings of folkloric inspiration (8). However, the pattern is not present in the Old Romanian corpus that we have surveyed, most probably because the old texts generally belong to the literary, written register.

- (7) a. *Cratița în care se coace cozonacul vine*
 pan.DEF in which CL.REFL.PASS bakes cake.DEF comes
unsă cu unt sau cu grăsimi, ca să nu
 smear.PPLE.F.SG with butter or with lard so that not
se lipească de ea cozonacul.
 CL.REFL.ACC stick of it cake.DEF
 ‘The pan in which the pound cake is baked *has to / must / ought to be / is smeared* with butter or lard so that the pound cake does not stick to it.’
- b. *Partea asta a feței de masă vine festionată.*
 part.DEF this GEN tablecloth.DEF.GEN comes hem.PPLE.F.SG
 ‘This part of the tablecloth *must / should / would have to be hemmed.*’

- c. *Firul vine bătut la margine.*
 thread.DEF comes beat.PPLE.M.SG at edge
 'The tread *should be sewn* at the edge.'
- d. *Grinda aceea vine așezată aici.*
 beam.DEF that comes place.PPLE.F.SG here
 'That beam *should be placed* here.'
- (8) a. *În coaja prăjinei vin însemnate, deosebit de*
 in bark.DEF pole.DEF.GEN come recorded.PPLE.F.PL different from
numărul oilor, gălețile... ce le
 number.DEF sheep.DEF.GEN buckets.DEF which CL.F.3PL.ACC
ia de la stână fiecare proprietar.
 takes from sheepfold each owner
 'On the edge of the pole, the buckets that each owner takes from the
 sheepfold *are recorded*, differently from the number of sheep.'
 (Păcală, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- b. *Peste temeiuri vin culcate, pe axele de lungime,*
 over foundation come placed.PPLE.F.PL on axes of length
bârnele de brad.
 beams.DEF of fir
 'The beams of fir *should be / are placed* over the foundation, on the
 length axes.'
 (Păcală, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)

From a Romance perspective, the existence of the 'come'-passive has been argued to follow from semantic considerations. Manoliu (1971: 204), Posner (1994: 180), and Iliescu (2003: 3274) have shown that, as passive auxiliaries, motion verbs (and especially the descendants of Lat. *venire*) in languages like Italian, Spanish, Old French, Rheto-Romance, Romanian, etc. (see also Bourdin and Giacalone Ramat and Sansò, this volume) have the advantage of maintaining the process meaning of the event, contributing a dynamic and, sometimes, durative overtone to the event, contrasting thus with the 'be'-passive, which has a static, resultative value.

Jordan (1950: 278) has shown that the Romanian *veni*-passive is not the equivalent of a prototypical *fi*-passive, but a periphrastic equivalent of the reflexive passive (cf. (5b)). Indeed, all the constructions in (7) and (8) may be approximately rephrased with the reflexive passive, rather than with the *fi*-passive. However, what distinguishes the reflexive passive (9) from the *veni*-passive ((7)–(8)) is that the former essentially expresses habituality (with its deontic meaning being a natural extension of the iterated, habitual one), while the latter

mainly has a weak deontic meaning (i.e. necessity). The substitution with the canonical *fi*-passive is possible (*este unsă* ‘is smeared’), but the resulting construction loses the modal meaning contributed by *veni*. Furthermore, a property which brings the *veni*-passive closer to the reflexive passive is that they are less felicitous with ‘by’-phases than *fi*-passives.

- (9) a. *se unge*
CL.REFL.PASS smears
‘one smears it’
- b. *se festonează*
CL.REFL.PASS hems
‘one hems it’
- c. *se bate*
CL.REFL.PASS beats (sews)
‘one sews it’
- d. *se aşază*
CL.REFL.PASS places
‘one places it’
- e. *se însemnează*
CL.REFL.PASS records
‘one records it’
- f. *se culcă*
CL.REFL.PASS place
‘one places it’

The analysis of the examples, on the one hand, and the fact that Iordan establishes a link between the reflexive passive (and not the prototypical *be*-passive) and the *veni*-passive, on the other hand, are cues for the semantic interpretation of the latter.

(i) In contrast with the *fi*-passive, which has a neutral, non-modal interpretation, the *veni*-passive incorporates a weak deontic or iterative value: *vine unsă* (comes smeared) as well as *se unge* (CL.REFL.PASS smears) do not mean ‘it is smeared’, but ‘it must be smeared’ or ‘typically, one smears it’. Thus, the difference between the *veni*-passive and the reflexive passive (10a-b), on the one hand, and the *be*-passive (10c), on the other hand, is shown by constructions in which a non-iterative / non-generic reading cannot be imposed, and the former are infelicitous.

- (10) a. **Astăzi, copilul vine lăudat* (de părinți).
 today child.DEF comes praised.PPLE.M.SG by parents
- b. ??*Astăzi, copilul se laudă* (de părinți).
 today child.DEF CL.REFL.PASS praise by parents
- c. *Astăzi, copilul este lăudat* (de părinți).
 today child.DEF is praised.PPLE.M.SG by parents
 'Today, the child is praised by his / her parents.'
- d. **Rezultatul vine știut*
 result.DEF comes known
- e. *Rezultatul se știe.*
 result.DEF CL.REFL.PASS know
 'The result is known.'

It is worth mentioning that there is also a very important aspectual difference between the *veni*-passive and the reflexive passive: the *veni*-passive is felicitous only with accomplishments (e.g. (7a)) and, marginally, with achievements (e.g. (7b)), being excluded from combinations with states (10d), while the reflexive passive occurs with accomplishments (9a), achievements (9e), as well as with states (10e) (activities must be set aside, as non-derived activities are mainly intransitive and do not play any role in the discussion regarding passive constructions). The fact that the *veni*-passive is compatible only with certain aspectual classes of verbs shows that this passive structure is primarily a modal one, as stative predicates are incompatible with (weak) necessity (i.e. deontic) usages. By contrast, the compatibility of the *se*-passive with a larger array of aspectual classes proves that the *se*-structure has also non-modal usages.

(ii) In all of Iordan's examples, the *veni*-passive is not accompanied by an agent phrase; the *veni*-passive, similarly to the reflexive passive, involves the demotion of the agent, which is in line with the generic reading of the structures; out of the examples above ((7)–(8)), (7d) is the only one which is ambiguous between a generic / weak modal reading and an episodic / punctual reading, and this is most probably the effect of the presence of deictic elements in the clause (*aceea* 'that', *aici* 'here').

(iii) As noticed by Bourdin (this volume), this type of *veni*-passive seems to be used in instructions related to cooking and handiwork and it occurs only in the 3rd person, a fact which suggests that this construction is covertly impersonal, as the one with *andare* in Italian.

In conclusion, the distinctive modal and aspectual contribution brought about by the auxiliary *veni*, presented in Section 3.2. below, has supplemented the Romanian passive domain with a dynamic passive construction (similar to other Romance dynamic passive constructions, and, in certain respects, to the English *get*-passive).

2.1.2 The *veni*-passive in old translated texts and in literary texts

In the Old Romanian corpus, the *veni*-passive occurs for the first time in non-ambiguous contexts in *Foietul novel*, a text from the period 1693–1704, translated by an Italian from the royal court of Constantin Brâncoveanu (Mareş 1993: 121). In *Foietul novel*, the occurrence of the *veni*-passive, which clearly copies an Italian structure, is far from being accidental, given its 28 occurrences, some of which are given below:

- (11) a. *Niște corăbii neguțătorești, den partea ei vin*
 some ships commercial from part.DEF her(GEN) come
arse (p. 7)
 burn.PPLE.F.PL
 ‘Some commercial ships from her part *are burned*’
- b. *Nesațiul unui lup vine stricat de un chibzuit*
 hunger.DEF a.GEN wolf comes spoil.PPLE.M.SG by a wise
cioban. (p. 35)
 shepherd
 ‘The hunger of a wolf is *spoiled* by a wise shepherd.’
- c. *Așteptarea ceii curți vine înșălată de un*
 waiting.DEF that.GEN court comes deceive.PPLE.F.SG by a
deșărt glas (p. 40)
 fake voice
 ‘The expectations of that royal court *are deceived* by a fake voice’
- d. *Un obrazu ostaș vine răsplătit cu*
 a honourable soldier comes rewarded.PPLE.M.SG with
haină de procurator (p. 41)
 cloth of prosecutor
 ‘An honourable soldier is *rewarded* with a prosecutor job’

- e. [... *robi...*] *pentru că unii vinu închiși* în temniță,
 slaves for that some come close.PPLE.M.PL in dungeon
alții vin tăiaț (p. 94)
 others come stabbed.PPLE.M.PL
 'because some of them (=the slaves) are locked in the dungeon, while others are stabbed'
- f. *Vine descoperită* o începătură de hicleșug,
 comes disclose.PPLE.F.SG a beginning of fraud
de un nărod prost, împotriva unor miniștri (p. 100)
 by a crowd stupid against some ministers
 'The beginning of a fraud is disclosed by a group of commoners, against some ministers'
- g. *De iute vânt vine răsipit* un pălcu de corabii (p. 108)
 by fast wind comes scatter.PPLE.M.SG a group of ships
 'A group of ships is scattered by a fast wind'
- h. *naltă cetate, de cumbarale, tunuri, sărutată vine* (p. 135)
 tall fortress by shells cannons kiss.PPLE.F.SG comes
 'a tall fortress is kissed (= harmed) by shells and cannons'

In Ienache Văcărescu's *Grammar* [1797], there is only one occurrence of the *veni*-passive (6b) (repeated below), which may be a consequence of the fact that the author had Italian sources, as also shown by the terminology he uses.

- (6b) *construzione sau alcătuire care dă Greci vine numită*
 construction or making which by Greeks comes name.PPLE.F.SG
sintaxis
 syntax
 '[...] construction or making which was / is named syntax by the Greeks'
 (Ienache Văcărescu, *Gramatica*, 1787)

The phrase *vine numită* (comes named) in this example has the meaning of a regular passive, *este numită* ('is called'), and represents a translation of Italian *viene chiamata* (Iordan 1950: 278).

In a later period (centuries 19–20), in other high-style, literary (mainly academic) texts, there appear passive structures with *veni*. Interestingly, all the authors of these texts were speakers of Italian:

- (12) a. *Câteva articlii de lege votați sub Carol abia acum*
 a.few articles of law voted under Carol just now
veniră **sanționați** și se
 came.SIMPLE.PRF sanction.PPLE.M.PL and CL.REFL.PASS
codificară cu formalitățile usitate.
 ratify with formalities usual
 ‘A few articles of law voted in Carol’s period *were* just now *amended*
 and ratified according to the usual formalities.’
 (Barițiu, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- b. *Ciocul [cârligului]... este aici relativ mare*
 tip.DEF [hook.DEF.GEN] is here relatively big
 și **vine așezat** ca la pripoane.
 and comes placed.PPLE.M.SG as at tethers
 ‘The tip of the hook is relatively big here and *is placed* as at the tethers.’
 (Antipa, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- c. [Numele] „Râpile” **vine** pentru întâia oară
 [the name] *Râpile* comes for first time
pomenit în documente.
 mentioned.PPLE.M.SG in documents
 ‘The name *Râpile* *is mentioned* for the first time in the documents.’
 (Ghibănescu, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)

The *veni*-passive from original or translated literary texts is not equivalent to the *veni*-passive from the popular, oral language. The *veni*-passive in (6b), (11) and (12) has the following characteristics:

- (i) it is equivalent to the prototypical *fi*-passive (*fi* + past participle) and does not display supplementary (root) modal values;
- (ii) in many cases, contrasting with the structure from the popular, oral language, it is accompanied by an agent phrase, specified as [+human]: *dă Greci* ‘by the Greeks’ in (6b), *de un chibzuît cioban* ‘by a wise shepherd’ in (11b), *de un nărod prost* ‘by a group of commoners’ (11f) or as [–human]: *de un deșărt glas* ‘by a fake voice’ in (11c), *de iute vânt* ‘by a fast wind’ (11g), *de cumbarale, tunuri* ‘by shells and cannons’ (11h);
- (iii) in contrast with the *veni*-passive found in the spoken language, the examples in this section are not subject to a generic reading;
- (iv) all the examples in (6b), (11) and (12) involve a simplex paradigm (*vine* ‘comes’ + past participle), and not a compound paradigm (*a venit* ‘has come’ + past participle), in line with what is found in Italian (Adam Ledgeway, *p.c.*).

2.1.3 The *veni*-passive in the Istro-Romanian variety

The *veni*-passive is also attested in the Istro-Romanian dialect / language. Timotin (2000: 487) has shown that, regionally, the verbs *veni* (‘come’) and *rămâne* (‘remain’) are used instead of the passive auxiliary. Her observation is based on the data collected by the dialectologist Matteo Bartoli: he noted that the passive form of the verb *ucide* (‘kill’) in Jeiăni (an Istro-Romanian village from Croatia) is a periphrastic construction in which *veni* is used as a passive auxiliary (13a); similarly, in Noselo (an Istro-Romanian village from the Istrian Peninsula in Croatia), the verb *rămâne* (‘remain’) is used as a passive auxiliary (13b). Both *veni* and *rămâne* are motion / location verbs. Yet another *veni*-passive form has been attested in a 1982 recording from Jeiăni (13c).

- (13) a. *ie vire ucis*
 he comes killed
 ‘he was killed’
- b. *ie ramas-a ucis*
 he remain-has killed
 ‘he was killed’
- c. *néca vire cășu yust* (in Sârbu and Frățilă 1998: 66)
 SUBJ come whey clogged
 ‘(so that) the whey is / gets clogged’

Although similar constructions are possible in Italian (Adam Ledgeway, *p.c.*: *è rimasto ucciso* ‘he was killed ~ he ended up dead’, for (13b)), according to the above quoted authors, these two villages have not been in direct contact with the Italian language, given their geographical placement; and thus, it is hard to consider that the existence of these constructions is the result of direct Italian influence. Timotin (2000: 488) claims that the range of the *veni*-passive structures was more extended prior to the dialectal investigations from which the examples in (13) are drawn. The *veni*-passive is also attested in the southern part of the Istro-Romanian speaking region (example (6c)), a territory which has been under Italian linguistic influence.

Putting these facts together, one may draw the following conclusions: even though Italian might have been one of the sources of the *veni*-passive in Istro-Romanian, this foreign influence cannot be entirely responsible for the existence of this periphrastic construction, since it is also attested in areas not influenced by Italian. Although the examples above (13) are very short, they seem to resemble the *veni*-passive structure from popular, oral Daco-Romanian, not the one from literary texts, which most probably copies the Italian model.

2.1.4 Summary

In conclusion, the existence of various (unrelated) passive *veni*-patterns in different varieties of Romanian indicates the natural predisposition of this verb to grammaticalize as a passive auxiliary.

As for the distribution of the constructions surveyed in this section, the following comments can be made. The structure found in popular, spoken Romanian is still productive (for instance, see the examples in (27) below, which are attestations from the internet). The loan translation from Italian is abundantly attested in *Foietul novel*, a translation highly influenced by its Italian source, and then only sporadically found in few texts from the 19th century and (the beginning of the) 20th century; this structure has not entered the mainstream language, as there is virtually no trace of its presence in present-day Romanian. As for the situation in the Istro-Romanian variety, the data presented above are the only available ones, and no other conclusions may be drawn until more data become available.

2.2 The other patterns illustrating the grammaticalization of *veni* ('come')

Even if we do not discuss in detail the other two patterns in which *veni* grammaticalized, we still need to briefly look at some additional data in order to show that these constructions are far from being accidental in Romanian.

Additionally, the last part of this section presents the usage of *veni* as a full deontic modal verb, a construction in which *veni* is not a grammaticalized (i.e. functional / semi-lexical) verb.

2.2.1 Romanian *veni* as a copula

Of the constructions discussed in this paper, the use of *veni* as a copula seems to be the oldest and the most unusual from a cross-linguistic perspective (it is attested in Italian and Italian dialects in structures similar to (14) and (15), but not in structures like (16) – Adam Ledgeway, *p.c.* –, and it has also been discussed by Nordhoff (2011) for Sri Lanka Malay). In the contemporary language, the *veni*-copula structures are typical of the spoken, popular language. Many of the *veni*-constructions, frequent and diversified especially in the southern area of Romania (Iulia Mărgărit, *p.c.*), may be accounted for by regular grammaticalization mechanisms. Others, however, remain enigmatic.

There are several patterns where *veni* functions as a bona fide copula in parallel with the regular *fi* ('be') copula.

In the *Treatise of Romanian Dialectology*, in the chapter devoted to the Walachian subdialect (*Tratat* 1984: 181) there are mentioned, besides the passive structures, constructions where *veni* functions as a copula, being followed by an adjective ((14a), (14b)), or by a bare noun (14c). In contrast with the "neutral" *fi*-copular structure, the *veni*-construction contributes a [+change of state] feature to the verbal event. *Veni* is thus the equivalent of the verb *deveni* ('become'), which is typical of the (modern) standard language.

- (14) a. *Atuncea-l scoate când să coace și... vine*
 then-CL.M.3SG.ACC pulls.out when CL.REFL.ACC bakes and comes
dulce, ... dă o dulceață.
 sweet ... of a sweetness
 'And then, (s)he pulls it out, when it is baked, and it *becomes sweet*,
 being of a great sweetness.' (TDM, I 780)
- b. *Pui un pumn dă tărățe ca să vie dulce.*
 (you)put a handful of bran so that.SUBJ comes.SUBJ sweet
 'You put a handful of bran in order for it to *become sweet*.' (TDM, I 772)
- c. *O trecut multă vreme pân' o vint copilul*
 has passed much time until has came child.DEF
ficior mare de-o fost de-nsurat.
 lad.DEF big so-that.has been SUP-married.SUP
 'It has passed a lot of time until the child *became a big lad*, ready to get
 married.' (DR, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)

Another construction in which *veni* has a copulative value is illustrated by examples like (15), where, in opposition to the structure discussed above, *veni* is synonymous with *fi* ('be'), and denotes a state, not a change of state:

- (15) a. *Am scos extracturi letinești dupe toate scrisorile...,*
 (I)have extracted quotes Latin out.of all letters.DEF
ca să vezi pricina acestui lucru cum vine.
 so that.SUBJ (you)see.SUBJ cause.DEF this.GEN thing how comes
 'I have written down Latin quotes from all the letters for you to see
 what *the cause of this thing is*.'
 (Bul. Com. Ist., in DLR, s.v. *veni*)

- b. *Că vor lucra cum s-au zis deasupra...*
 that (they)will work how CL.REFL.PASS=has said above
tot una vine, lăsați-i și așa, să lucreze.
 also one comes let-CL.3PL.M.ACC also like this SUBJ (they)work.SUBJ
 ‘That they will work as stated above, it is *the same thing*; let the work
 like this.’ (Petrovici, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- c. *Drept cam ciudat vine.*
 certainly rather strange comes
 ‘Certainly, *it is rather strange*.’ (Alexandrescu, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- d. *Vedeți, frații miei, cum munca preceapere vine*
 (you)see brothers.DEF mine how labour skill come
bogatului.
 rich.man.DEF.DAT
 ‘You see, my brothers, that labour *means / is skilfulness* for the rich man.’
 (Coresi, *Evanghelie cu învățătură*)
- e. *[părul] la înpletit vine foarte urât*
 hair.DEF at braid comes very ugly
 ‘when braided, the hair is *very ugly*’ (Studii și documente)

Yet another construction with copular *veni* is illustrated by the examples in (16), where its subjective predicative complement² is a relational noun (i.e. a kinship or occupation noun). In contrast with examples like (14), but like the examples in (15), copular *veni* has a static value in these structures (Pană Dindelegan 2008a: 285):

- (16) a. *Ion vine văr lui Gheorghe.*
 John comes cousin DAT George
 ‘John is *George’s cousin*.’
- b. *Ea îmi vine soră*
 she CL.1.SG.DAT comes sister
 ‘She is *my sister*’

The pattern in which the subjective predicative complement of *veni* is a kinship noun is attested rather late, in the 20th century:

² The concept “subject predicative complement” denotes the predicative of a copula verb in English traditional terminology (cf. Huddleston and Pullum 2005: 76).

- (17) a. *Deși îi veneam nepot de veri primari,*
 although CL.3.SG.M.DAT came nephew of cousins primary
nu-l cunoșteam nici din vedere.
 not-CL.3.SG.M.ACC knew neither of sight
 ‘Although I was his nephew (out) of a first degree cousinship, I didn’t
 even know what he looked like.’ (M. I. Caragiale, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- b. [*Prietenii*] *ofiterului veneau, cum s-ar zice,*
 friends.DEF officer.DEF.GEN came how CL.REFL.PASS=would say
cumetri cu alde Ciupitu cârciumarul.
 godfathers with (the) Ciupitu publican.DEF
 ‘The friends of the officer were, as one would say, the godfathers of
 Ciupitu the publican.’ (Camil Petrescu, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- c. [*Tânărul*] *e student. Ne vine cam rudă.*
 young-man.DEF is student. CL.1.PL.DAT come approximately relative
 ‘The young man is a student. He is a sort of relative of ours.’
 (Călinescu, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)

2.2.2 Romanian *veni* as an inceptive verb

Romanian *veni* is also found in partially grammaticalized structures where it (still) has argumental structure, but has undergone severe semantic bleaching. Interestingly, we can trace back the evolution of this structure from Old Romanian to Modern Romanian. As with other *veni*-structures, the inceptive structure is also attested in Italian (Adam Ledgeway, *p.c.*: *mi viene da ridere quando sono ubriaco* ‘I feel like laughing when I am drunk’).

The inceptive value is attested since the earliest Romanian texts. In the first stages, the complement of *veni* was a mere nominal phrase (18a, b). In an intermediate stage, this complement was expressed by psych-nouns like *toană* ‘mood’, *chef* ‘mood’, *nebuneală* ‘madness’ (18c, d). Finally, more recently, the verb *veni* can take a subjunctive complement (as in (3), repeated below).

- (18) a. *De greșaste omul, nu-i vine luiș [...] foamea.*
 if errs human.DEF not=CL.3SG.DAT come him.DAT hunger.DEF
 ‘If humans make mistakes they don’t get hungry (as they would normally do).’
 (Coresi, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)

- b. *Când de multul vin se îmbeată,*
 when of much.DEF wine CL.REFL.ACC get-drunk
atunci vine râsul.
 then comes laughter.DEF
 ‘When one gets drunk, one *starts to laugh*.’ (Bojincă, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- c. *Iar i-o venit toana nebuniei.*
 again CL.3SG.DAT=have come mood.DEF madness.DEF.GEN
 ‘He *has started acting* mad again.’ (Alecsandri, in DLR; s.v. *veni*)
- d. *Dacă-i vine așa o nebuneală sergentului*
 if=CL.3SG.DAT comes such a madness sergeant.DEF.DAT
să spuie că el e stăpânul averii...
 SUBJ say.SUBJ that he is owner.DEF wealth.DEF.GEN
 ‘If the sergeant *starts acting* crazy by saying that he is the owner of the wealth...’ (Caragiale, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- (3) *Îmi vine să plâng.*
 CL.1.SG.DAT (it)comes SUBJ cry.SUBJ.1.SG
 ‘I *feel like crying*.’

2.2.3 Romanian *veni* as a deontic modal verb

This value of *veni* (obligatorily preceded by a reflexive marker), mentioned in the introduction (ex. (4)) for Old Romanian, was lost in the transition to Modern Romanian. The fact that Romanian modal verbs are not fully grammaticalized³ (as they are, for instance, in English), corroborated with the replacement of *veni* by *cuveni* (< Lat. *convenio* ‘to be one’s due; to be fitting that’) as a modal verb led to the fact that this value did not persist and grammaticalize in Romanian. However, the existence of this value at some point in the history of Romanian is important from a typological perspective, and we may speculate that it also counts for explaining the modal value acquired by *veni* as a passive auxiliary.

The development of this modal value was most probably influenced by old translations from Slavonic. *Veni* surfaced with this value mainly in religious texts, which have been substantially influenced by the Slavic model. This is why *veni* was used instead of *cuveni*, the regular impersonal verb which has been used to express the deontic value in Old Romanian and in Modern Romanian as well.

³ For instance, they still have lexical usages, they preserve the ability to select a complement clause, they have a rather large c-selection domain, selecting both finite and non-finite clauses, etc. (see Zafiu 2013, for a comprehensive survey).

- (19) a. *[Oile] ceale reale se veniia lui Laban.*
 sheep those bad.PL CL.REFL.ACC come.IMPV DAT Laban
 ‘Those bad sheep were Laban’s due.’ (PO, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- b. *Părinte, dă-mi ce mi să vine.*
 father.VOC give=CL.1SG.DAT what CL.1SG.DAT CL.REFL.ACC come
 ‘Father, give me what is due to me.’ (Varlaam, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- c. *Jumătatea de roada cea de lemn... mi să vine mie a lua.*
 half.DEF of harvest DEF of wood CL.1SG.DAT CL.REFL.ACC come
 me.DAT INF take.INF
 ‘A half of the wood harvest is due to me (to be given to me).’
 (Biblia 1688, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)
- d. *M-am lăpădat de tot ce s-ar fi putut veni mie prin tot dreptul.*
 CL.REFL.1SG.ACC=(I)have abandoned of all what
 s-ar fi putut *veni* me prin tot dreptul.
 CL.REFL.ACC=would be could come me.DAT through all right.DEF
 ‘I abandoned all that was due to me by all rights.’
 (Cantacuzino, in DLR, s.v. *veni*)

In all these contexts, *veni* was subsequently replaced by *cuvini* in the transition to the modern language.

3 Accounting for the grammaticalization paths

The aim of this section is to answer, in turn, the questions raised at the beginning of the paper, by examining the factors that led to the rise of each pattern. As in the previous section, we will grant more attention to the passive construction.

3.1 Why *veni* was chosen: semantic and syntactic explanations

Recall the first question raised in the introduction:

- (i) Given that in Romanian there are several verbs expressing the final point of motion (*veni*, *ajunge*, *sosi* ‘~ come, arrive’), why is it that *veni* (and not other near-synonymous verbs) grammaticalized in these constructions? How did the lexical semantics and syntax of *veni* influence this multiple-output grammaticalization?

It is well known that motion verbs are frequently engaged in grammaticalization processes (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 69, 73, 74, 78; Stolova 2005: 197; Nicolle 2007: 48; among many others). But *not all* motion verbs grammaticalize. What makes a motion verb *a good candidate* for grammaticalization?

The three Romanian verbs expressing motion towards the speaker's deictic centre are *veni*, *ajunge* and *sosi*, which are interchangeable in most contexts when used with the genuine motion meaning; they contrast as to how they relate to the deictic centre. Deictic motion verbs, which incorporate the path of motion, are good candidates for becoming functional verbs (Nicolle 2007: 47). However, of these three verbs, as we have seen, only *veni* has undergone a multiple grammaticalization process; *ajunge* only grammaticalized as a copula verb, by a well-known metaphorical semantic change: change of location (the genuine meaning (20a)) to change of state (copula (20b)); the verb *sosi* has only lexical usages (20a). Furthermore, in contrast with *veni* and *ajunge*, which are inherited from Latin, *sosi* is a Modern Greek loanword (cf. the etymologies in DA / DLR); it is thus a lexical item which entered Romanian at a later stage. The effect of this historical timing is that *sosi* is the least polysemous of the three verbs under discussion, and that it has only lexical values.

- (20) a. *Ion ajunge / sosește acasă*
 'John arrives home'
- b. *Bisericile Domnului ajunseseră grajduri*
 church.DEF God.DEF.GEN arrive.PLUPERF stables
 pentru caii păgânilor.
 for horses.DEF pagans.DEF.GEN
 'God's churches had become stables for the pagans' horses.'
- (Ispirescu, in DA, s.v. *ajunge*)

The choice of *veni* over *ajunge* and *sosi* is the combined effect of the lexical semantics and syntax of *veni*.

From a semantic point of view, the verb *veni* is the most polysemous of the three verbs discussed. This is true not only for Modern / Contemporary Romanian, but also for Old Romanian (for example, in DA / DLR, the thesaurus dictionary of the Romanian language, there are 44 pages dedicated to *veni*, 4 pages dedicated to *ajunge*, and 2 pages to *sosi*). Similarly to other motion verbs that grammaticalized in various languages (Fr. *aller*, Engl. *go*), *veni* is highly polysemous so it displays a high degree of semantic complexity, a fact which favoured its grammaticalization (Bybee 1993: 153; Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuka 1994: 5).

Syntactically speaking, *veni* is unaccusative in all its occurrences, contrasting with *ajunge* and *sosi*, which also had or still have transitive usages (21). Thus, from

this perspective too, *veni* is the best candidate for grammaticalization (at least for grammaticalization as a passive auxiliary).

- (21) a. *Ajunseră cetatea Brusa.* [Old Romanian]
 (they)arrived fortress.DEF(ACC) Brusa
 'They arrived at the fortress of Brusa.' (Moxa, in DA, s.v. *ajunge*)
- b. *Alergă cu mare iuteală ca să o sosească.*
 ((s)he)ran with great speed in order to CL.3SG.F.ACC arrive
 '(S)he ran very fast in order to reach her.' (Gorjan, in DLR, s.v. *sosi*)
- c. *L-am ajuns când vira la stânga.* [Mod. Rom.]
 CL.3SG.M.ACC=have arrived when (he)turned at left
 'I reached him when he was turning left.'

The fact that the passive structure is the unaccusative structure par excellence, in that it is derived in the syntax (rather than in the lexicon), favours the choice of unaccusative verbs as candidates for grammaticalization as passive auxiliaries. This is also consistent with Haspelmath's (1990: 38) observation that passive auxiliaries typically grammaticalize from non-agentive verbs. This theoretical correlation takes the form of a statistical universal. The most widely spread passive auxiliary is the verb 'be' (English, Spanish, Polish, Finish, Lithuanian, Baluchi, Urdu, Quechua – Siewierska 1984: 126), a verb which is unaccusative in all its occurrences. Furthermore, if we take into consideration the survey in Siewierska (1984: 126), it is easy to notice that most of the verbs which grammaticalized in the world's languages as passive auxiliaries are unaccusative verbs: 'become' (German, Swedish, Polish, Latvian, Kupia, Kolami, Hindi, Nez Perce), 'go' (Bengali, Hindi, Gujarati, Maitil, Ossetian, Italian and Gaelic), 'suffer (~undergo)' (Vietnamese, Thai, Cambodian, Burmeze, Dravidian Tamil, Kannada); the verb 'come' is also attested as a passive auxiliary in a few languages: Kurdish Kashmiri, Maithil, and Italian (Siewierska 1984: 126); for an extensive inventory of languages in which the 'come'-passive is attested, see Giacalone Ramat and Sansò (this volume). Passive auxiliaries originating in transitive verbs are also attested (*get*, *receive*, *eat* Siewierska 1984: 126, *have* – La Fauci and Loporcaro 1989: 162, 180) but to a much more limited extent; the construction in which transitive verbs grammaticalized as passive auxiliaries may correspond to intransitive usages of these verbs (absolute usages, null complement anaphora, etc.).

Another factor, pertaining to the lexical semantics / syntax interface, is that the *veni*-passive structure is compatible only with accomplishments and achievements, that is, with telic predicates. This can be related to the fact that, in contrast with *ajunge* and *sosi*, lexical *veni* expresses motion towards the speak-

er's deictic centre, which is interpreted as the endpoint of the action from an aspectual point of view.

3.2 The role of the context and the persistence of the original meaning of *veni*

The second question raised in the introduction is as follows:

- (ii) Does the grammaticalization of *veni* represent a change in meaning (of the type metaphor, metonymy, etc.) and/or an instance of re-analysis (triggered by a specific distributional context)? How important is the (narrow distributional) context in this process? How did the original meaning of *veni* influence the semantics of the *veni*-passive construction?

The variety of distributional contexts in which *veni* appears with an inceptive value in the history of Romanian is an indication that the grammaticalization of *veni* as an inceptive verb did not happen in a narrow distributional context (see Section 2.2.2). Rather, it is more plausible to assume that a metaphorical mutation from [change of location] to [change of state] conceptualized as inception (see also Bourdin, this volume), followed by semantic bleaching has led to the (partial) grammaticalization of *veni* as an inceptive aspectual verb (example (3)), a change which is also categorial in nature (lexical > functional / semi-lexical (i.e. aspectual)). Therefore, the usage of *veni* as an inceptive verb originates in a *change in meaning*, and is accompanied by a categorial mutation as well.

By contrast, the grammaticalization of *veni* as a passive auxiliary and as a copula is a good illustration of the idea expressed by Bybee (2004: 146) that “grammaticalization of lexical items takes place within *particular constructions*” with “grammaticalization [being] the creation of new constructions”. This type of reasoning, that what is fundamental in the grammaticalization process is the context, has also been employed in the description of the grammaticalization of Engl. *go* as a future auxiliary in the structure *be going to* (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 87; Disney 2009). In what follows, we will show that this explanation carries over to Romanian passive and copular *veni*-structures. The hypothesis we put forth is that the passive structure found in spoken Romanian grammaticalized independently (from the loan translation passive from Italian, discussed in Section 2.1.2) in structures like (22), which have been attested as early as the 16th century (the earliest surviving Romanian writings). It is not clear whether these structures are instances of a *veni*-passive or of a secondary predication biclausal structure, in which both *veni* and the associated past participle are independent predications with individual semantics. This ambiguity (reflected

below by double translations) probably persisted for a long period. What deepens the ambiguity is the fact that the *veni*-passive construction matured in the spoken variety, and, thus, there are very few written records which would unveil its evolution.

- (22) a. **Blagoslovit vine, în numele Domnului, împăratul**
 bless.PPLE.M.SG comes in name.DEF God.DEF.GEN emperor.DEF
izraililor.
 Israelis.GEN
 'The Israeli's emperor *comes and is blessed* in the name of God.'
 'Blessed is in the name of God the Israeli's emperor.'
 (Coresi, *Evanghelie cu învățătură*)
- b. **"Blagoslovită vine împărăție părintelui nostru David,**
 bless.PPLE.F.SG comes reign father.DEF.GEN our David
în numele Domnului", ce se zice „den Dumnezeu".
 in name God.GEN what CL.REFL.IMPERS says of God
 '[That's why, rejoicing he said]: «Blessed comes the reign of our father David in the name of God», that is, «from God».'
 '[That's why, rejoicing he said]: «Blessed is the reign of our father David in the name of God», that is, «from God».'
 (Coresi, *Evanghelie cu învățătură*)

Therefore, what appears to be crucial in this case is the combination *veni* + past participle, a narrow distributional context which served as the basis for re-analysis (a similar context favoured the grammaticalization of *andare* as passive auxiliary in Italian – see Mocciaro, this volume). Two supplementary pieces of evidence favour this conclusion. First, a similar explanation is suggested by Vincent (1982: 84, 2012: 429–430) who considers the periphrastic [auxiliary + past participle] constructions (including the passive) in Latin to originate in biclausal constructions. The Old Romanian examples in (22), where *veni* appears next to a past participle, are exactly the same kind of biclausal constructions discussed by Vincent for Latin periphrastic constructions. Second, a type of ambiguity like the one above still persists in Modern Romanian; this will be discussed in greater detail below (see also Giacalone Ramat and Sansò (this volume) for the similar situation in Italian).

Let us now turn to the *veni*-copula of the type illustrated in (16) and (17). We claim that the appearance of this structure is based on factors which are of the same nature as those invoked for the *veni*-passive structure. Iordan (1950: 278) and Pană Dindelegan (2003: 137, 2008b: 136–137) have each put forth explana-

tions essentially based on the replacement of the copula *fi* ‘be’ by *veni*, on the basis of their synonymy in other contexts.

While this factor, the semantic affinity of *veni* and *fi* ‘be’ in Romanian, might have contributed to the rise of this structure, we believe that what is crucial in the grammaticalization of this structure is the syntactic context. Namely, throughout the history of Romanian, one finds a recurring combination of *veni* with bare, person-denoting nouns, which have a kind-level denotation, as in (23) below.

- (23) a. *Pătrașco-vodă, cea bunul, **au venit domn** în sâmbăta*
Pătrașco-vodă that good.DEF has come king in Saturday
Paștilor, 7062.
Easter.GEN, 7062
‘Pătrașco-vodă, the good one, came king in the Easter Saturday, 7062.’
(Anonimul cantacuzinesc)
- b. *Mircea-vodă iar au **venit domn** al treilea rând.*
Mircea-vodă again has come king the third time
‘Mircea-vodă (be)came again king for the third time.’
(Anonimul cantacuzinesc)
- c. *de va voi, să **vine dascăl** aici la mine.*
if (he)will wish SUBJ come teacher here at mine
‘If he wishes he may (be)come (a) teacher here, at my place.’
(Studii și documente)

Notice that in (23) the person-denoting nouns denote an official function / dignity. In the next historical phase (our first attested contexts of this second stage are from the 20th century), kinship nouns denoting an indirect kinship relation (*cumnat* ‘brother-in-law’, *socru* ‘father-in-law’, *cuscu* ‘father of a son- / daughter-in-law’, *văr* ‘cousin’, etc.) have been attracted into this pattern (see (17) above, and (24a) below). Thus, chronologically, nouns denoting official dignities precede kinship nouns in this pattern. Importantly, nouns denoting a direct kinship relation (*mamă* ‘mother’, *tată* ‘father’, *fiu* ‘son’, *frate* ‘brother’, *bunic* ‘grandfather’, etc.) are excluded from the combination with the copula *veni* (24a). This lexical squish is a clear indication that a rudiment of the initial motion semantics has been preserved by *veni* in this structure: namely, the kinship relation expressed by the subjective predicative complement has to be arrived at in an indirect manner; this is a conceptual difference very similar to that expressed by the contrast between *he is here* vs. *he has come here*. Crucially, with direct kinship relations, the copula *fi* ‘be’ is the only possibility (24b):

- (24) a. *Îmi vine văr / nepot / *tată / *fiu / *bunic.*
 CL.1.SG.DAT comes cousin nephew father son grandfather
 'He is my cousin / nephew.'
- b. *Îmi este tată / fiu / bunic (/ văr / nepot).*
 CL.1.SG.DAT is father son grandfather cousin nephew
 'He is my father / son / grandfather (/ cousin / nephew).'

Further comments should be made on the behaviour of the *veni*-passive structure found in spoken Romanian.

Unlike the usual *fi*-passive and the reflexive passive in Romanian, the *veni*-passive has a root modal meaning, most probably derived from its iterative / habitual or generic meaning. The special modal-aspectual values acquired by *veni* in passive structures accounts for the incompatibility of this type of passive construction with the Romanian compound past, which is always perfective (and hence non-dynamic / punctual) from an aspectual point of view.

As announced, in the present tense, a sentence like the following, without an appropriate linguistic context, is systematically ambiguous between a passive reading (25a) and a secondary predicate interpretation (25b) of the [*veni* + past participle] sequence:

- (25) *Cartea vine pusă în cutie.*
 book.DEF comes placed in box
 a. 'The book is (usually) / must be placed in a box.' (passive reading)
 b. 'The book comes (i.e. it arrives) in the state of being placed in a box.'

Interestingly, the tenses of the past display a rather sharply contrasting behaviour. The *compound past* tense, which is strictly perfective in Romanian, only allows for the biclausal, secondary predicate, interpretation of the [*veni* + past participle] sequence, and *veni* retains its change of location lexical meaning (this is the case for Italian too, as Adam Ledgeway, *p.c.*, pointed out to us: *il re è venuto circondato da numerosi cortigiani* 'the king arrived surrounded by many courtiers'):

- (26) a. [...] *al cincilea cadou a venit așezat pe boboci de trandafiri galbeni*
 the fifth gift has come placed on flowers of roses yellow
 'the fifth gift came / arrived placed on yellow roses' (internet)
- b. *setul verde a venit așezat într-o cutiuță de bijuterii și*
 set.DEF green has come placed in-a box of jewellerys and
m-a surprins plăcut gestul pentru că astfel chiar arăta
 me=has surprised nicely act.DEF because this way indeed look

a dar.

as gift

‘The green set *came placed* in a box of jewellerys and this fact really surprised me as it indeed looked like a gift.’ (internet)

By contrast, in the *imperfect* tense, which is strictly imperfective, the sequence [veni + past participle] is interpreted as a passive structure, and the lexical meaning of *veni* is completely eliminated (see Bourdin, this volume, who argues that “when it comes to the co-encoding of necessity by itive or ventive passives perfective aspect is cross-linguistically disfavoured”; see also Mocciaro, this volume, for the differences between perfective and imperfective in Italian passives):

- (27) a. *la toate mașinile pe care le-am meșterit eu,*
 at all cars.DEF PE which CL.3PL.F.ACC=have fixed I
rulmentul venea așezat pe furca aceea, dar la mine părea
 bearing.DEF came placed on fork.DEF that but at me seemed
că e exact invers.
 that is exactly opposite
 ‘With all the cars I fixed, the bearing *was placed* on that fork, but in my case it seemed exactly the opposite.’ (internet)
- b. *e vorba de stratul cel mai de sus al fundației, cel peste*
 is word of layer DEF more of up of foundation.GEN CEL over
care venea așezat primul rând de cărămidă.
 which came placed first roll of brick
 ‘We are talking about the upper most layer of the foundation, the one over which the first layer of bricks *was placed*.’ (internet)

This contrast between (26) and (27) above can also be described as one between a single predication represented by [veni + past participle] in the imperfective viewpoint versus a multiple predication of this structure in the perfective viewpoint.

In Section 2.1.1, we have insisted on the special modal-aspectual properties of the *veni*-passive. The contrasting behaviour of this structure in the tenses of the past is in line with its modal-aspectual values in the present tense. The deontic and iterative values imposed by the *veni* auxiliary on the verbal event are incompatible with the *perfective* nature of the *compound past* tense. This is because a deontic (/root) modal base cannot be imposed upon closed events or, as Hacquard (2009: 280) puts it, “perfective aspect eradicates the modality”.

It is well known that structures containing root modal verbs in past perfective events no longer have a modal meaning but a descriptive, reporting meaning, requiring “their complement to hold in the *actual* world, and not merely in some possible world” (Hacquard 2009: 282) (*You have to close the door* [deontic] → *You had to close the door* [descriptive]). Consequently, the only reading available to *veni* with sentences in the perfective aspect is that of a motion verb.

By contrast, sentences in the imperfective viewpoint are “informationally open” (Smith 1991) or, putting it differently, the imperfective viewpoint does not present a closed event, although it allows inferences about its beginning and/or ending; thus, a modal base may be imposed upon an event in the imperfective viewpoint. Furthermore, “imperfective comes with its own layer of modality, which [...] forces it [= the event] to happen in the worlds provided by the modal element of the imperfective” (Hacquard 2009: 302). The combination of the imperfective viewpoint, which independently contributes a layer of genericity, with the deontic and iterative values of the passive auxiliary *veni* yields a habitual or dispositional reading of the sentences in the imperfect, illustrated in (27).

The special interaction between modality and aspect displayed by Rom. *veni* can thus be added to the topic of impossible modal and auxiliary combinations, which has been pursued in the literature in different guises (e.g., Picallo 1990 and, more recently, Wurmbrand 2003: 184 and Hacquard 2009).

In conclusion, we may characterize the *veni*-passive of the spoken language as follows: in contrast with the regular ‘be’-passive, which is static, the *veni*-passive is dynamic; in contrast with the reflexive passive, the *veni*-passive contributes a stronger deontic or iterative value to the verbal event; in the imperfect, the passive auxiliary *veni* yields a habitual, dispositional reading of the verbal event.

The fact that the modal readings are cancelled out by the perfective aspect further demonstrates that the *veni* passive construction is a root modal construction since epistemic modal readings are not overridden by perfective aspect (Hacquard 2009: 279). Furthermore, the different modal meanings, essentially pertaining to root modality, expressed by the *veni*-passive structure verify the idea that distinct modal meanings generate one another (Arigne 2007). Grammatical aspect, which is syntactically superior to root modality (Hacquard 2009: 279, 285; cf. also Butler 2004), plays a crucial role in generating these distinct modal meanings.

3.3 The Latin heritage and the issue of language contact

Consider the third and the fourth questions raised in the introduction:

- (iii) Given that some of these constructions are also attested in Latin (with *venire*) and that there are parallel developments in Romance, what is the contribution of the Latin heritage to the existence of the wide variety of structures involving Rom. *veni*?
- (iv) Is it the case that language contact may have contributed to the emergence of one of the constructions above?

The alleged Latin ‘come’-passive is illustrated in the literature by examples like the following:

- (28) *Si iumentum de via coactum ueniet* [Latin]
 if cattle of road forced will.come
 (*coactus* = past participle of *cogo*)
 (*Mulomedicina Chironis*, in Bourciez 1956: 268)

Similarly to what is found in Romanian, Bourciez (1956: 268) claims that the Latin ‘come’-passive is attested since 400 AD, alongside the regular analytical ‘be’-passive; in contrast with the regular passive, this type of passive contributes a [+dynamic] aspectual value to the event denoted by the verb.

Ernout and Meillet (1959, s.v. *uenio*), who also record the existence of the Latin ‘come’-passive, argue that the starting point for this usage has probably been the use of *uenio* in collocations like the one below:

- (29) *uenire amatus*
 come.INF loved

Bourciez suggests that the Latin ‘come’-passive has been preserved in the area of Italy and Raetia; the author’s comments lead to the idea that Italian and some Rhaeto-Romance varieties have developed these structures to a larger extent than Latin.

However, this claim, very often accepted in the literature, seems to be contradicted on two different reasons.

First, as Adams (2013) shows, most of the examples cited in the literature for Latin are simply not passives. (28) is not a passive and does not mean ‘if the horse will be forced’ and any attempt to associate *coactum* with *ueniet* in this example is simply misguided. The author further shows that the actual meaning of (28) is ‘if a horse comes from the road having been pushed too hard’ (*cogo*

being a technical term meaning ‘to force a horse beyond its capacity leading to serious physical harm’), in which *coactum* is a predicative participle modifying *iumentum* and is not associated with *ueniet*, just as in the Romanian examples in (26) above.

The second argument comes from a closer look at the developments in the Romance languages. While the examination of the evolution of the descendants of Latin *venire* is beyond the goals of this paper, it is instructive to mention a few sharp differences between Romanian and Italian which show that Lat. *venire* has taken different paths of evolution in the Romance languages, refuting thus the claim that the ‘come’-passive attested in Romance is directly inherited from Latin (see also Giacalone Ramat and Sansò, this volume, who show that the ‘come’-passive emerged independently in Italian, and Vincent 1987, 2011 for the emergence of periphrastic constructions involving an auxiliary + a participle in Latin).

Salvi and Renzi (2010: 144) show that, in contrast with Modern Italian, Old Italian always uses *essere* (‘be’) not *venire* (‘come’) as a passive auxiliary, a fact which excludes the continuity from Latin of the *venire* passive structure. In Old Italian, in the construction *venire* + participle, *venire* has the meaning ‘diventare’ (= become):

(30) *E allora gli cavalieri tutti vennoro smarriti*

and then the knights all came lost

[diventarono smarriti, si smarirono].

became lost si lost

‘And then, all the knight were lost.’

(*Tavola rotunda*, cap. 93, p. 352, in Salvi and Renzi 2010: 146)

The difference between the three passive auxiliaries of Italian (*essere* ‘be’, *andare* ‘go’ and *venire* ‘come’) is studied by Maiden and Robustelli (2007 [2000]: 282–284). Comparing Maiden and Robustelli’s results on the Italian passive auxiliaries with our description of Romanian above, three important facts may be observed:

1. With respect to semantic interpretation, the Romanian *veni*-passive from the spoken language is similar to the Italian *andare*-passive, both types having a dynamic and a deontic modal meaning (compare Rom. (6a) with It. *la lampadina va svitata* ‘the bulb is unscrewed’ – see also Bourdin, this volume);
2. by contrast, from the perspective of the restrictions on compound forms, the Romanian *veni*-passive is similar to the Italian *venire*-passive, which does not surface as a passive auxiliary in compound forms;
3. on the other hand, the Romanian *veni*-passive from Italian translations resembles syntactically and semantically the *venire*-passive of Italian.

Thus, provided that almost identical values may be expressed with the use of different motion verbs grammaticalized as passive auxiliaries (e.g. It. *andare* and Rom. *veni*), the ‘come’-passive constructions attested in the Romance languages are not etymologically inherited from Latin (as Adams (2013) has shown). Rather, their existence in Latin and their re-emergence in the Romance languages is the effect of the recursive (typological) tendency of distinguishing between a static, resultative passive and a dynamic (and sometimes modal) passive (Iliescu 2003: 3274).

Two of the constructions reviewed above in Section 2 appear to be the result of language contact. First, the lexical usage of *veni* as a deontic modal verb (examples (4), (18)) is the result of Slavic influence. Second, the *veni*-passive in Old Romanian texts translated from Italian ((6b), (10), (11)) is the result of indirect language contact (by means of translation). By contrast, the other constructions analysed above (*veni* as a passive auxiliary in the popular, oral language, as copula and as an inceptive verb) have emerged independently in Romanian, although some of them have late Romance correspondents.

On the other hand, the question of language contact reveals a more interesting aspect. What distinguishes the structures resulting from language contact from those emerging independently in Romanian is their status throughout the history of Romanian. The structures resulting from contact have been present in Romanian for a short period of time and in a very limited inventory of texts: the lexical deontic usage of *veni* was present in texts heavily influenced by Slavic translation, and the loan translation passive is well attested in a single text (*Foietul novel*), a translation from Italian, and then sporadically in texts written by bilingual (Romanian-Italian) authors. These constructions have thus not been part of the mainstream usage at any historical moment. By contrast, the structures emerging in Romanian have been uninterruptedly productive throughout the history of Romanian, and they are still preserved in different varieties of the present-day language.

3.4 A multiple grammaticalization path

The final question posed in the introduction is the following:

- (v) Finally, do the Romanian data illustrate a single grammaticalization path (with cascade effects) or do they illustrate independent grammaticalization processes?

Given all the examples analysed above, this last question might sound superfluous, as it is clear that the Romanian data surveyed indicate that what is at

play are independent grammaticalization paths, which have started to manifest themselves at different moments in time.

Veni as a **passive auxiliary** has two sources: one is the loan translation from Italian ((6b), (10), (11)), and the other ((1), (7), (8), etc.) is grammaticalization as re-analysis inside Romanian in contexts in which *veni* was followed by a past participle (21).

Veni as a **copula** has different language-internal sources: the latest grammaticalized value (e.g. (2), (23a)) is based on the genuine semantic content of *veni* as a motion verb, with the re-interpretation triggered in a specific grammatical context (22), and conceptualized as a transfer from [change of location] to [marker of an indirect (kinship) relation] (cf. (23)). For the two other copular usages of *veni* it is hard to put forth a plausible grammaticalization scenario because of the following facts: the dynamic copular *veni* (13) is attested only in modern dialectal texts, is specific to the spoken language, and there are no relevant attestations in the older stages of Romanian; by contrast, the static copular *veni* (14) is attested since the earliest Romanian writings and has not changed its usage and values ever since.

Finally, **inceptive** *veni* has been attested since the earliest Romanian texts (17); throughout the history of Romanian it has changed its syntactic (selection) properties: initially, it could only take a nominal phrase as its complement (17); in an intermediary stage, its complement consisted of a [nominal phrase + subjunctive] cluster (17d); finally, the nominal was dropped and *veni* was followed by a subjunctive complement (3). Thus, the grammatical context was also instrumental in the case of this development.

4 Conclusions

In conjunction with the overall goals and research questions of the present volume, the following conclusions may be drawn as to the grammaticalization of the Romanian motion verb *veni* ('come'):

- (i) Romanian *veni* fruitfully illustrates the idea that the same lexical item can be simultaneously involved in several grammaticalization processes.
- (ii) These grammaticalization processes are based on various mechanisms: both semantic change operations (metaphor, transfer) and narrow distributional factors (i.e. specific contexts of re-analysis) have concurred to yield a multitude of constructions (with specific usages and meanings) in the present-day language.

- (iii) Language contact factor can be claimed to be of low importance since the constructions influenced by foreign patterns (two in this case) did not enter the mainstream language and were active only for a short period and in a limited array of texts.
- (iv) Although some of the Romanian structures (have been claimed to) have Latin correspondents, their development inside Romanian as well as the fact that they also “emerged” in other Romance languages indicates that they are not etymologically inherited from Latin. What seems to be at play in fact is a typological recurrence factor rather than direct inheritance.
- (v) Finally, one may also comment on the specific contribution of *veni* / *come* to problem of the grammaticalization of motion verbs in general.

Veni appears in constructions parallel to *fi* ‘be’ and supplements the predication with a special semantic value such as [dynamic] / [change of state], [inceptive], [deontic] or [indirect (kinship) relation], which can all be traced back to the genuine motion meaning of *veni* and viewed as resulting from semantic bleaching. In the competition of more than one verb expressing motion towards the speaker’s deictic centre, such as the one between *veni* – *ajunge* – *sosi* (~ ‘come, arrive’), it is the verb which has the most semantic values and appears only in one syntactic guise (unaccusative), *veni*, which is chosen for grammaticalization as a passive auxiliary. The affinity of *veni* with the passive construction, which is prototypically an unaccusative construction, is straightforward.

Abbreviations

cl	clitic
def	definite (article)
pluperf	pluperfect
ppl	participle
subj	subjunctive
sup	supine

Corpora

- Coresi, *Carte cu învățătură* (1581), ed. Sextil Pușcariu & Alexie Procopovici, București, Atelierele grafice Socec & Co., 1914.
- Cronicari munteni*, Ediție îngrijită de Mihail Gregorian, Studiu introductiv de Eugen Stănescu, I, *Stolnicul Constantin Cantacuzino, Anonimul Cantacuzinesc, Radu Popescu*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1961.
- DA – *Dicționarul limbii române*, tomurile I-II, București, 1913–1948.

- DLR – *Dicționarul limbii române*, serie nouă, tomul XIII, partea I, litera V, V-veni, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1997.
- Dosofoței, *Psaltirea în versuri* (1673), ed. N. A. Ursu, Iași, Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei, 1974.
- Foletul novel. Calendariul lui Constantin Vodă Brâncoveanu, 1693–1704*, ed. Emil Vârtosu, București, 1942.
- Studii și documente cu privire la istoria românilor*, vol. VIII, *Scrisori de boieri și negustori olteni și munteni către casa de negoț sibiiană Hagi Pop*, publicate cu note genealogice asupra mai multor familii de N. Iorga, București: Stelierele grafice Sococ & comp.
- TDM I, II, III – *Texte dialectale Muntenia*, vol. I–III, ed. Boris Cazacu, București, Editura Academiei, 1973–1975–1987.
- The electronic database of Old Romanian texts of “Iorgu Iordan - Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest

References

- Adams, James. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arigne, Viviane. 2007. Grammaticalization, polysemy and iterated modality: the case of *should*. *CORELA* 1(5)
<http://corela.edel.univ-poitiers.fr/index.php?id=343> (accessed 5 May 2012).
- Bourciez, Edouard. 1956. *Éléments de linguistique romane. quatrième édition*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Bybee, Joan. 2003. Cognitive processes in grammaticalization. In Michael Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language*, volume II, 145–167. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Butler, Jonny. 2004. *Phase Structure, Phrase Structure, and Quantification*. York: University of York doctoral dissertation.
- Disney, Stephen D. 2009. The grammaticalization of “Be going to”. *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics* 15: 63–81.
- Ernout, Alfred & Antoine Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. Tome II. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Hacquard, Valentine. 2009. On the interaction of aspect and modal auxiliaries. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32: 279–315.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticalization of passive morphology. *Studies in language* 14: 2572.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*, 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2005. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iliescu, Maria. 2003. Phénomènes de convergence et de divergence dans la Romania: morphosyntaxe et syntaxe. In Gerhard Ernst, Martin-Dietrich Gleßgen, Christian Schmitt & Wolfgang Schweickard (eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte / Histoire linguistique de la Romania*, vol. 3, 3266–3281. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Iordan, Iorgu. 1950. Note sintactice. *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* I, no. 2. 269–279.

- La Fauci, Nunzio & Michele Loporcaro. 1989. Passifs, avancements de l'objet indirect et formes verbale périphrastiques dans le dialecte d'Altamura (Pouilles). *Rivista di linguistica* 1 (1): 161–196.
- Maiden, Martin, Cecilia Robustelli. 2007 [2000]. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian*, second edition. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Manoliu, Maria. 1971. *Gramatica comparată a limbilor romanice*. Bucureşti: Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică.
- Mareş, Alexandru. 1993. Cine a fost Ioan Romanul, alias Frâncul. II. *Limba română* 3. 117–122.
- Nicolle, Steve. 2007. The grammaticalization of tense markers: a pragmatic reanalysis. *Cahiers Cronos* 17: 47–65.
- Nordhoff, Sebastian. 2011. Having *come* to be a copula in Sri Lanka Malay – an unusual grammaticalization path. *Folia Linguistica* 45 (1): 103–126.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2003. Note asupra pasivului. In *Elemente de gramatică. Dificultăţi, controverse, noi interpretări*, 133–139. Bucureşti: Humanitas Educaţional.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2008a. Numele predicativ. In *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. 2, 267–295. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2008b. Construcţii pasive şi construcţii impersonale. In *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. 2, 133–144. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.
- Picallo, Carme M. 1990. Modal verbs in Catalan. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8: 285–312.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1994. *The Romance Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rusu, Valeriu (ed.). 1984. *Tratat de dialectologie românească*. Craiova: Scrisul Românesc.
- Salvi, Giampaolo & Lorenzo Renzi. 2010. *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, vol. 1. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Sârbu, R., V. Frătilă. 1998. *Dialectul istroromân*. Timişoara: Amacord.
- Squartini, Mario. 1999. Voice clashing with Aspect: the case of Italian passives. *Rivista di linguistica* 11: 341–365.
- Squartini, Mario. 2003. La grammaticalizzazione di <venire + participio> in Italiano: anti-causativo o risultativo. In Claus D. Pusch & Andreas Wesch (eds.), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (Ibero-)romanischen Sprachen*, 23–34. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *The passive. A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*, London, Sydney, Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Stolova, Natalya I. 2005. Expressing time through space: a comparative diachronic perspective on Romance periphrastic past and future. In Martine Coene & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *On Space and Time in Language*, 193–207. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium.
- Timotin, Emanuela. 2000. Modalităţi de exprimare a pasivului în dialectele româneşti sud-dunărene. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* 2: 481–490.
- Vincent, Nigel. 2011. Non-finite forms, periphrases, and Autonomous Morphology in Latin and Romance. In Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith, Maria Goldbach & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.), *Morphological Autonomy. Perspectives from Romance Inflectional Morphology*, 417–435. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wurmbbrand, Susanne. 2003. *Infinitives. Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zafiu, Rodica. 2013. Modality and evidentiality. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, 575–584. Oxford: Oxford University Press.