

UNDERGROUND TYPOLOGICAL TENDENCIES DANUBIAN LATIN AT THE CROSSROADS OF CONTRARY LINGUISTIC TYPES

by
Maria Manoliu-Manea

The evolution of Danubian Latin is brought into the picture to support the hypothesis that mixed typological types cannot survive and that one of the types in contact is always dominant even if, for a certain span of time, the impact of a different type seems to be so strong as to change the main synchronic characteristics of the previously dominant type. This is the case with the Romance type as represented by the Danubian Latin which came into contact with different if not even contrary types such as Slavic, Balkan, and Germanic. The struggle between these types can account for the so-called deviant features of Romanian.

As Eugenio Coseriu has emphasized several times, the linguistic *type* as a superordinate level to *system(s)* is definable as a set of principles which govern both the synchronic interconnections of a system and the diachronic processes (Coseriu 1952, 1958). From a diachronic point of view, the type is characterized by the following phenomena: (a) the presence in various languages of similar diachronic rules; (b) the persistence of analogous mechanisms which may or may not utilize identical means (Coseriu 1968).

The present paper deals mainly with the ways in which the diachronic dimensions of a language change when in contact with different or even contrary types. It is our belief that 'mixed types' cannot survive and that one of the types in contact is always dominant, even if, for a certain span of time, the impact of a different type seems to be so strong as to change the main characteristics of the previously dominant type. Our analysis focuses on the case of Danubian Latin whose evolution presents the main characteristics of the pan-Romance type, in spite of the fact that it has been in permanent contact with Slavic, Germanic and Balkan languages. It is no secret that Slavic or Balkan influences have been often considered when explaining various aberrant features of Romanian. But, according to our hypothesis, the non-Romance factor alone cannot explain the way in which the Romanian grammar has reshaped Latin categories. For advancing credible explanations it is necessary to examine the impact of Romance

general diachronic tendencies upon Slavic or Balkan typological features when reinterpreted by Romance speakers. In what follows we intend to analyze only three of these 'deviations', namely:

- (a) the remotivation of the so-called neuter gender;
- (b) the way in which a three-case nominal declension was remade: (i) by the postposition of the cliticized definite article and (ii) by the grammaticalization of certain prepositions in a different way than in other Romance areas;
- (c) the way in which active relational tenses have been developed: (i) the conservation of a synthetic pluperfect indicative (i.e., the former Latin pluperfect subjunctive); (ii) the integration of periphrastic 'be'-constructions into the indicative paradigm (active voice).

At first glance, these phenomena seem to contradict some main Romance typological characteristics:

(a) *The elimination of the neuter from the grammatical category of gender.* Due to a conceptual change, whose motivation goes beyond the scope of the present study, the opposition between agentive (active) and inactive referents (i.e., [\pm Active]) ceased to be a part of noncontextual (inherent) semantic features of the noun. In brief, referents ceased to be considered inherently active or passive. Consequently, a *neuter gender*, functioning as a marker of the inherent semantic feature [Inactive, non-agentive], becomes obsolete (see Meillet's hypothesis (1921-1937), Manoliu 1990 and Posner 1993). The so-called 'Romance neuter' usually refers to pronouns but not because they are controlled by neuter nouns as was the case in Latin. In fact, the neuter pronouns have been remotivated in different ways (for French neuter demonstratives, see Boone 1987 and Manoliu 1990; for Spanish, see Ojeda 1993, to mention only a few recent approaches). In Romanian there is a special distributional class of nouns called 'neuter nouns', that behave as masculines in the singular and as feminines in the plural. In the opinion of some, a similar distributional class may be found in other Romance areas, but only in Romanian have they reached a high degree of productivity and frequency: according to Cârstea (1970:20), more than 22% of nouns are neuter, with a frequency of 21%.¹

(b) *The replacement of enclitic bound case markers with proclitic (usually cliticized) markers.* The dominant unmarked word order in Latin, SOV, gave way to the SVO order, following more closely the oral informational structure, in which the topic is fronted and the comment follows (the verb represents a transitional part of the comment and the objects the focal point of the comment). It has been generally accepted that this typological change has triggered the loss of the enclitic case markers and favored anteposition, at the level of both NPs and VPs: prepositions in NPs, clitic pronouns, auxiliaries in VPs. Even in languages such as Old French and Occitan where case markers are attested until the 13th century, the two-case declension presented a different distribution of syncretisms than in Romanian, namely:

O.Fr. and O.Occ. had two main cases: a subject-case and an object case, for all non-subject functions (*cas sujet* and *cas régime*);

Romanian has three case-markers: (i) for the nominative /accusative; (ii) for genitive/ dative, and (iii) for vocative (which is sometimes identical to the nominative).

(c) In our opinion, the interpretation of the 'inactive', 'nondynamic' feature as a *situationally governed feature* has also triggered important changes in the verbal system, namely:

(i) In Latin, voice was also organized around 'agentivity': the active voice was agent centered, and the medio-passive form in *-r* was activity centered, presupposing a demotion of the agent. In Romance, voice has been reorganized, not only because it is no longer a morphological marked category, but also because a true passive, result-centered, developed in opposition to the active (initiator-/ agentive-centered) and to the reflexive (activity-centered)².

(ii) If the passive is *result-centered*, a morphological aspectual marker for *perfectum*, the aspect focussing precisely on the final point of the activity and its result may be viewed as redundant. Consequently, even the compound forms, traditionally regarded as means of reconstituting aspectual oppositions, are remotivated as pragmatic means for expressing present relevance (see for example, Fleischman 1983). In other words, the main aspectual opposition that dominates the entire temporal system in Latin, that is *infectum* vs. *perfectum*, becomes less important, if not entirely redundant. The Romance temporal system is less marked for aspectual differences of

this kind and more for inchoativity (see Hoepelman and Rohrer 1980) and duration (see Harris 1978:153-156). Meanwhile, the oral character of the Latin registers which developed into Romance languages has favored the development of relational tenses for marking various discourse and narrative strategies. While following a similar path, the Romanian tense system presents several striking differences from other Romance areas. It has generalized 'to have'/PRES for the CP and 'to be' as the auxiliary of past tenses in the subjunctive, conditional, optative, and presumptive and in double compound tenses of the indicative, both for transitive and for intransitive verbs. Moreover, when integrated into the active tense paradigm, 'be'-compound forms were reinterpreted as means for expressing temporal relations rather than aspectual differences. In French or Italian the distribution of the auxiliaries 'to have' and 'to be' obeys various constraints and above all the constraints imposed by verb valencies and by their aspectual inner features such as [\pm Stative]. In Ibero-Romance, *ser* 'to be' specialized only for plain passives or for expressing the progressive aspect.

Aberrant as they may seem when compared with other Romance areas, the use of preposed case markers beside bound postposed morphemes and clitic anaphors and the reinterpretation of tenses are in striking contrast with the non-Romance types which came into contact with the Danubian Romance, either Slavic or Germanic:

- (α) Germanic, Slavic or Balkan languages have preserved a rich nominal inflection.
- (β) In Slavic languages, tense is subordinated to aspect, the latter being in fact the main means for marking discourse temporal hierarchies (see Hopper 1982).³
- (γ) As recently argued especially in generative approaches, German belongs to the SOV type.

In what follows we seek to prove that even when the non-Romance types had a strong impact on the development of Danubian Latin, the resulting phenomena have been remolded in such a way as to agree with more general pan-Romance tendencies.

1. When neuter becomes neutral

The so-called 'neuter gender' has been the object of many discussions, which often proposed contradictory solutions and interpretations:

- (i) According to Robert Hall Jr. (1965), the neuter represents 'a pseudo-problem', since no Romance language has a special form of agreement between nouns and its determiners (including the adjectives) that is different from masculine and feminine markers.
- (ii) Rosetti (1950, 1957, 1963, 1968, 1975) and Diaconescu (1967, 1968, 1970) have argued that the Romanian neuter has to be considered as a grammatical gender, because the agreement between the noun and its determiners is different from both masculine and feminine (see (1)).

- (1) neuter: *tablou frumos* - *tablouri frumoase*
 painting beautiful:MASC/SG - paintings beautiful:
 FEM/PL
 'beautiful painting - beautiful paintings'

but, masculine:

- băiat frumos* - *băieți frumoși*
 boy beautiful:MASC/SG - boys beautiful:MASC/PL
 'handsome boy - handsome boys'

feminine:

- fată frumoasă* (vs. neuter *frumos*) - *fete frumoase*
 girl beautiful:FEM/SG - girls beautiful:FEM/PL
 'beautiful girl - beautiful girls'

Neuter nouns share with mass nouns the ending *-uri* (see *mătăsură* 'silks':PL), but feminine mass nouns have two forms in the singular: e.g., *mătase* 'silk': NOM/ACC/SG and *mătăsi* 'silk': GEN/DAT.

The semantic (re)motivation of the neuter distributional class has also been a controversial matter:

- (i) According to Rosetti, the Romanian neuter is a remake of the Latin neuter with Romance means, which finds a perfect semantic correspondence in its Latin counterpart in that the neuter is linked to the feature [Inanimate].
- (ii) According to Graur (1954, 1957, 1965), the opposition between neuter and non-neuter (masculine and feminine) is in no way a

remake of the Latin category of gender, for the following reasons: As Meillet (1921-1937) emphasized, in Latin the difference between neuter and non-neuter rests on the semantic distinction between 'inactive beings or things' and 'active, agentive forces' (including persons and also natural forces and even things). Compare:

- (2) masculine: *vir* 'man', as well as *ignis* 'fire', *ventus* 'wind',
 feminine: *femina* 'woman' and also *terra* 'earth', *pirus* 'pear-tree' or *prunus* 'prune-tree',
 and neuter: *pirum* 'pear', *templum* 'temple', *saxum* 'stone', etc.

As has been mentioned before, in Romanian, as in other Romance languages, this difference no longer belongs to the domain of inherent noun features. In Old Romanian it seems that there was a tendency to remotivate the morphological differences to correspond to the opposition between living beings and non-living entities, [\pm Living] (Ivănescu 1957). The proof is that several Latin masculine nouns became neuter in Romanian:

- (3) Lat. masc. *ventus* 'wind' - *venti* 'winds', *focus* 'fire-place' - *foci*

- (4) Rom. neuter: *vânt* 'wind' - *vânturi*, *foc* 'fire' - *focuri*,

with the neuter ending *-uri* (< Lat. *ora*, a false analysis of nouns such as *corpus* - *corpora* 'body (-ies)', *tempus*-*tempora* 'time(s)').

In Romanian, however, the neuter agreement is not limited to nouns bearing the feature [-Living]; it also characterizes various nouns referring to collective living beings: (5) *popor* 'people', *stol* 'flock', etc. The feminine ending rests on a collective neuter marker which can be found both in Greek and Latin: cf. (6) Lat. *locus* 'place' - *loci* 'places: MASC/PL', but also *loca* 'place(s), region': NEUTER /collective plural, *jocus* 'game' - *joci* 'games: MASC/PL', but also *joca* (collective neuter plural)⁴. As I have argued elsewhere (see Manoliu 1970, 1986, 1994:348-349, 351) the entire evolution of Romanian gender is in accordance with the general Romance tendency to remotivate the gender distinction on the basis of the difference between masculine and feminine. In Romanian, the only definition of neuter gender that could account for its present uses is 'the indifference to sex distinctions' (either because the object does

not present such features, or because its referent may include both males and females). In other words, if the semantic oppositions are considered, feminine is the marked term [+Female], masculine is the unmarked term [-Female], common gender (cf. (7) *un/lo gură-cască* 'a:MASC/a:FEM loafer') represents the complex terms [\pm Female], because it can refer either to males or to females, while neuter is the neutral term [0[\pm Female]].

2. The three-case declension and the preposed markers

2.1. *The means of reviving the nominal inflection.* According to Dardel and Wüest (1993), French and Romanian declensions developed out of the second cycle of the Latin nominal inflection that distinguishes three main cases: (i) Nominative/Accusative; (ii) Genitive, and (iii) Dative. If French and Occitan (as well as some Romansh dialects) lost their noun inflection after the 13th century, Romanian has kept and even remade case differences. It is no secret that this 'conservatism' has to be connected with its areal position within the Central and Eastern European linguistic area, rich in nominal inflection, as attested by languages of different families and types, such as German, Slavic languages, Greek or Hungarian.⁵ Moreover, Romanian has succeeded in generalizing a three-case inflection by the following means:

(α) by encliticizing the definite article (for the explanation of the encliticization of the definite article by the attraction of the inherited case endings see Vasiliu 1953, Manoliu 1985) - see Tables 2-3;

Table 1: Declension without a definite article

Declension	1st : <i>fată</i> 'girl'		2nd: <i>copil</i> 'child'	
	Singular	Plural	Sing.	Pl.
number				
case				
NOM/ACC	<i>fată</i>	<i>fete</i>	<i>copil</i>	<i>copii</i>
GEN/DAT	<i>fete</i>			
VOC	<i>fato!</i> <i>st. fată!</i>	<i>fete!</i>	<i>copile!</i>	<i>copii!</i>

Table 2: Declension with an enclitic definite article

declension	1st: <i>fata</i> 'the girl'		2nd: <i>copilul</i> 'the boy'	
	singular	plural	singular	plural
NOM/ACC	<i>fata</i>	<i>fetele</i>	<i>copilul</i>	<i>copiii</i>
GEN/DAT	<i>fetei</i>	<i>fetelor</i>	<i>copilului</i>	<i>copiilor</i>
VOC	<i>fato!</i>	<i>fetelor!</i>	<i>copilule!</i>	<i>copiilor!</i>

(α) by preserving some of the Latin Vocative forms:

(8) *doamne!* '[O] God!', *bărbate!* 'husband!';

(γ) by borrowing the Slavonic Vocative ending *-o*:

(9) *soro!* 'sister!', *fato!* 'girl!', *Mario!* 'Mary!'

See also the declension of an invariable noun such as *pui* 'chicken' in (10):

(10)	Sg:	Pl.
Nom/ Ac.	<i>puiul</i>	<i>puii</i>
Gen/Dat.	<i>puiului</i>	<i>puilor</i>
Voc.	<i>puiule!</i>	<i>puilor!</i>

Table 3: Proper nouns

Declension	1st.: <i>Maria</i>	<i>Cici</i>	2nd.: <i>Ion</i>	<i>Vasile</i>
NOM	<i>Maria</i>	<i>Cici</i>	<i>Ion</i>	<i>Vasile</i>
ACC	<i>pe Maria</i>	<i>pe Cici</i>	<i>pe Ion</i>	<i>pe Vasile</i>
GEN/DAT	<i>Mariei</i>	<i>lui Cici</i>	<i>lui Ion</i>	<i>lui Vasile</i>
VOC	<i>Mario!</i>	<i>Cici!</i>	<i>Ioane!</i>	<i>Vasile!</i>

If the syncretism between nominative and accusative may be explained by Dardel and Wüest's hypothesis, the merger between dative and genitive is more in line with the distribution of cases in the Latin feminine declension, where the genitive and the dative singular had the same form as the nominative plural (see for example *femina* 'woman' in (11)):

(11) Sg.	NOM:	<i>femina</i>	Pl. <i>feminae</i>
	GEN/DAT:	<i>feminae</i>	

The distribution of syncretisms following the model of the first Latin declension might have been preferred just because it had the support of the number opposition. Number differences, being better motivated semantically than gender or case, have been better preserved and even reinforced by new morphological and syntactic means everywhere in the Romance domain (see for example the role of Fr. *liaison*, which serves to mark the number of the noun, because the noun enclitic number marker, *-s*, dropped).

2.2. *The preposed markers.* Dardel and Wüest's hypothesis may also explain the spread of the preposed case markers such as the preposition *ad* (>Fr. *à*, Rom. *a*) from dative to genitive (noun complements), since it is a replica of the distribution of the pronominal clitics, which generalized dative forms in the singular: Fr., Rom. *lui* 'to him' and 'his' (see (12)).⁶

(12)a. *îngerii slujindu lui* (CÎ, 38)
angels-the serving him:IO
'the angels serving him'

(12)b. *în casa lui* (CÎ:11)
in house-the his:POSS
'in his house'

In languages such as Ibero-Romance and Sardinian, which continued the Latin declension in its first stage of evolution, the same *ad* spread from the IO to the DO. If in French attributive *à* has limited functions (e.g., (13) *fil à papa* 'daddy's boy', *un ami à moi* 'a friend of mine', *un pot à confiture* 'a preserve pot'), in Romanian, the fate of the preposition *a* has followed a more complicated path. In Old Romanian, *a* could introduce:

α) the dative indirect object (IO):

- (14) *cine poate sluji a oamenilor*, (Coresi, *Cazania 1*: 379)
 who can serve A men-the:DAT
 'who can serve the men'

β) the accusative indirect object (IO):

- (15) *dede a lucrători* (CT. MT, 87, in Rosetti 1986: 272)
 gave/he A workers:ACC
 'he gave to [the] workers'

γ) the noun complement:

- (16) *palaturile cele înalte și desfătate*
 palaces-the/FEM/PL those tall and wonderful
a crailor și a împăraților
 A kings-the:GEN/DAT and A emperors-the:
 GEN/DAT
 'The kings and emperors' tall and wonderful palaces' (Cantemir,
Divanul 1: 54.8)

In Moldavian and north-western Romanian sub-dialects (Maramureș, Crișana) as well as in some Sub-Danubian dialects (Istro-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian), an invariable *a* (or Mgl. *ăl, áu*) spread to noun complements and possessives (see Rusu, ed. 1984). In standard registers and in some sub-dialects (Muntenia) and in Macedo-Romanian, the preposition *a* was eliminated in favor of the inflected demonstrative.⁷

In standard Romanian, *a* (as a noun-complement marker) has been replaced by an inflected form, whose origin is still controversial: *al*:MASC/SG; *a*:FEM/SG; *ai*: MASC/PL; *ale*: FEM/PL, which agrees with the head-noun (see (17a-d)).⁸

- (17)a. *brațul cel înalt*
 arm-the:MASC/SG the:MASC/SG tall
al preînălțatului Dumnezeu
 that:MASC/SG highest-the:MASC/SG/GEN God
 'the tall arm of the Most High God' (Iv, *Predici*:76)
- b. *a lui avuție*, CÎ, 16
 that:FEM/SG him:GEN wealth:FEM/SG
 'his wealth'
- c. *iubire de oameni ai lui Dumnezeu*
 love of people:MASC/PL those:MASC/PL the:GEN God
 'love of God's people'
- d. *cu ale tale gândure* (CV, 285)
 with those:FEM/PL your:FEM/PL thoughts:FEM/PL
 'with your thoughts'.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into further details regarding the constraints governing the choice of genitive or both genitive endings and preposed markers. More important for our discussion is the fact that Romanian has developed preposed markers for introducing the IO and the noun complement, like any other Romance language.

2.3. *Discourse salience and direct object markers.* As in other Romance languages such as Spanish, Portuguese, Sardinian and several Southern Italian dialects, Romanian has three ways of marking direct objects:

(a) the accusative form of the noun:

- (18) *Ion a văzut o fată*
 John has seen a:ACC girl:ACC
 'John saw a girl'
- (19) *Ion a dat cartea unei fete*
 John has given book-the:ACC a:DAT girl/DAT
 'John gave the book to a girl'

(b) the preposition *pe* 'on' and the accusative form of the noun:

- (20) *Examinam pe fata de lângă fereastră*
 was-I gazing on girl:ACC-the:ACC by window-the
 'I was gazing at the girl by the window'.

(c) The prepositional construction may be copied onto the verb by a cliticized personal pronoun in the accusative:

- (21) *Ion o vede pe fată*
 John her:ACC sees on girl:ACC
 'John sees the girl'.

The spread of the preposition *p(re)* (<Lat. *super + per*) from directional locatives (cf. *privea pre ei* '(s)he looked toward them') to direct objects has also been a controversial matter in Romance and Romanian linguistics. In order to explain this 'deviation', the following factors have been invoked (for details see Manoliu, 1994:3-47):

(a) Syntactic necessities for desambiguating the postposed subject and the personal specific direct object (which could be also sentence-initial as topicalized or focalized) (see Graur 1968, Niculescu 1965, Bossong 1991). If acceptable for the very earliest Old (Middle) Romanian texts, this hypothesis cannot account for the constraints imposed on the present distribution of *pe*.

(b) More recently, cognitive and discourse approaches have offered new solutions. For Tasmowsky (1987), *pe* is a marker of mental salience.⁹ For Manoliu (1994), *pe* is a marker of a high degree of discourse activated knowledge (see Table 4 below). In any case the hypothesis of Slavic influence has been eliminated altogether.

Table 4: The variables responsible for the direct-object constructions in contemporary Romanian.

Syntactic constructions	Inherence	Noun Category	Degrees of mental activation		Scenic distance	Degrees of discourse salience	
			very low	intermediate		very low	low
V + Indef. NP/ACC	+Human	common	very low	intermediate	-foregrounded	intermediate	low
V + NP/ACC + Def. Art	+Human	common	intermediate	low	+ foregrounded	high	very high
V + <i>pe</i> + Indef. NP/ACC	+Human	common	low	high			
V + <i>pe</i> + N + Def. Art.	+Human	common Pro: Indef. Quantif Interrog.	high	very high			
NP/ACC + Cl + V	-Human	common					
a) Cl + V + <i>pe</i> + Def. NP/ACC	+Human	proper common Pro: Pers. Demonst. Relative					
b) <i>pe</i> + Def. NP/ACC + Cl + V							

If spoken Romanian rather than standard literary Romanian is considered, an interesting pattern of preposed case-markers may be detected:

- (22) subject: noun complement:
mama a venit rochia lu mama
 mother-the has come dress lu:INV(riable) mother-the
 'my mother has come/came' 'my mother's dress'

- (23) indirect object:
i am dat o lu mama
 her have-I given it:FEM/SG lu mother-the
 'I gave it to my mother'
le am pus apă la flori
 them:DAT have-I put water to flowers
 'I watered the flowers'

- (24) direct object:
am văzut-o pe mama
 have-I seen her pe mother
 'I saw my mother'

If one considers the entire evolution of Romanian, it is very likely that this preposed case marking pattern could already have been generalized, had Romanian been less controlled by 'academic rules'.

3. The bleaching of the aspectual difference between *perfectum* and *infectum*

Since Antoine Meillet's description of classical languages, the Latin tense system has been divided into two main aspects, namely *infectum* (i.e., the imperfect, terminative/resultative aspect) and *perfectum* (the perfective aspect). This is perhaps the reason for the fact that in most current approaches to the history of Romance languages, the development of compound forms has been considered as a means of cyclically remaking this aspectual opposition: simple perfect forms > compound perfect forms > double compound perfect forms (see for example the references to Foulet 1925, Cornu 1953 in Price

1975:229-231). More recent discourse and textual studies focussing on the narrative values of tenses have shown that compound forms, especially those with a dual-reference point, have precise discourse functions marking the event hierarchy, various degrees of grounding (foregrounding, backgrounding, etc.), and last but not least, the relation between the narrated events, narrator's and characters' attitudes and interpretations of the events (see Rohrer 1987, Fleischman and Waugh, eds. 1991, Manoliu 1994:275-294).¹⁰

3.1. *Discourse values of past-tenses in Middle Romanian.* As I hope to have demonstrated elsewhere (see Manoliu 1994:269-317), the hypothesis that the rich development of tense paradigm in Romance is due to discourse necessities is also validated by the functions of Romanian compound and double compound tenses based on the auxiliary 'to be' (see (25) and (26)).

(i) Compounds with the verb *a fi* 'to be' in the indicative could express either progression (see (25) – IMPF (i.e. imperfect + GERUNDIVE or Double Compound Progressive Past)) or an open-ended temporal interval pointing to key-events (see (26) – Double Compound Past).

- (25)a. *era având vrajbă între ei* (CT:135)
 'there was (lit. was having) animosity between them'
 b. *când se scornea vânt s-au fost strângând troiane la garduri și la gropi, de pulbere, ca de omăt* (Ur:154)
 'every time the wind started to blow: IMPF, piles of dust, like snow drifts, were gathering: DCP [lit. refl. have been gathering] against the fences and in the pits'.

- (26) *Ștefan-Vodă cel Bun, când s-au bătut cu Hroit unгурul, precum zicu unii la Casen, iar letopisățul scrie că s-au bătut la Scheia pe Siretu, au fost căzut calul cu Ștefan-Vodă în războiu. Iară un Purice aprodul i-au dat calul lui* (Nec:166)
 'King Stephen the Good, when [he] fought: CP with Hroit the Hungarian, as they say at Casen, but the Chronicle writes that he fought: CP at Scheia, on the river Siret, the horse with King Stephen fell: DCP [lit. has been fallen] in the battle. And then a [so called] Purice ('Flea') the usher gave: CP him his horse.'

In (26) the entire story finds its *raison d'être* in the event expressed by the DCP, which is the 'fall of the horse with the King'.

(ii) Compounds with 'to be' in the future perfect, the subjunctive or conditional might have served as perfective tenses but even in Old Romanian they could be used as mere past tenses and reinterpreted as modal expressions.

(a) past subjunctive: (α) evidential:

(27) *Iar doamna lui Dragoș-vodă, așa povestescu oamenii acei de locu, de la târgul Siretului, cum să fie fost de leage sască* (Nec:161, 18th c.)
'and King Dragoș's spouse, as the people of the place, from the market town of the river Siret, say, was [lit. that be:SUBJ/PRES been] of Saxon religion'.

(β) optative:

(28) *O oară să fi fost amici/Să ne iubim cu dor/S-ascult de glasul gurii micil/ O oară și să mor!* (Eminescu, *Pe lângă plopii fără soț*, 19th c.)
'[For] one hour could we have been [lit. that be:INV been] friends/ To make love [lit. that we make:SUBJ/PRES love] with [infinite] lust/ To listen to the voice of [your] little [=dearest] mouth/ one hour and [then] I could have died [lit. One hour and that die:SUBJ/PRES]!'

(b) conditional: non-realized condition and/or conditioned event in the past:

(29) *Dacă m-ar fi iubit cât de puțin, aş fi făcut orice ca să o fac fericită*
'Had she loved:COND/PAST me a little bit, I would have done:COND/PAST anything to make her happy'.

(30) *Cum n-ar fi fostu fără primejdiia Vasile-vodă atunci, de n-ar fi stătut împărătiia după lucrurile împotriva perșilor* (MC: 95, 17th c.).
'So King Vasile would not have been without danger at that very moment, if the Turkish Empire had not been involved: COND/PAST in the war against the Persians'.

'Be'-constructions also served for creating a new mood of 'supposition', the so-called *presumptive*.

(α) present presumptive:

(31) *o fi iubind*
will (have):3rd/SG be:INV loving
'(s)he must be loving'

(β) past presumptive:

(32) *o fi iubit*
will be:INV loved:PP
'(s)he must have loved'

3.1.1. In Middle Romanian texts (16th c. – 18th c.), the temporal paradigm could be used for marking various narrative strategies. Roughly speaking, the basic system of past tenses may be described as a three-fold paradigm of narrative markers as follows:

a. The simple perfect (SP), the shortest form, serves to present events in fast motion, marking turning points, the passage from one narrative unit to another, or a synthesizing description of the event frame;

b. The compound past (CP), a somewhat mid-length form, foregrounds events presenting them at a regular pace;

c. The double-compound past (DCP), the longest construction, marks the highest degree of narrative prominence by presenting the event(s) in slow motion (see Manoliu 1994: 289-290).

3.1.2. The causes of the integration of 'be'-periphrases into the tense paradigm, instead of the pan-Romance compounds based on the auxiliary 'to have' must have been connected with the following phenomena specific to the Danubian Latin area:

(a) the early cliticization of the verb *a avea* 'to have', which developed distinct forms as an auxiliary verb of the compound past (CP), on the one hand (see 33a), and a longer form, for the aspectual and the predicative verb, on the other hand (see 33b). Compare:

combination with a past participle was felt as being more appropriate for expressing textual hierarchies than 'have'-constructions.

A confusion between active transitive 'be'-periphrases and the plain passive (expressed by the same auxiliary 'to be' and the past participle) was unlikely due to their different informational and discourse structure, which triggered different word orders:

(i) In passives the topical direct object occurred as a preverbal subject and the most dynamic participant was introduced by the preposition *de* 'by' (SV by NP):

- (37) *în mănăstire în Putna,*
 in monastery in Putna,
care era zidită de dânsul (Ur:121)
 which was built by him
 'in the Putna monastery, which was built by him (i.e., Steven the Great)'

(ii) Since the transitive active 'be'-periphrases were means of marking a high degree of discourse salient (key-) events, their non-topical subject occurred in postverbal position (V (X) S order). Moreover the most likely candidate for an agentive interpretation, i.e. the direct object referring to persons, was preceded by the prepositional marker *pe* 'on' (see 2.3 above) and when highly discourse salient, by a preverbal accusative clitic pronoun:

- (38) *li- au fost puindu pe jupânesie* (Nec:231)
 them/ACC has been obliging on ladies
 'he obliged the ladies'.

The Slavonic 'be':IMPF + a special form of the past participle, with the value of a pluperfect (see 3.2 below), could have served as a model for the 'be' + PP constructions in Old Romanian, but the point is that the Romanian construction in which the auxiliary 'to be' is in the imperfect, which is still present in the 16th-c. texts, becomes very rare in the following centuries and disappears in contemporary Romanian. Instead of the imperfect, Romanian double-compound forms use the pan-Romance creation, namely the compound past of 'to be'. In other words, even if the support of the Slavic model is not excluded, the Romanian double-compound forms have been

reintegrated into the pan-Romance type of tense system:

- (i) on the one hand, the imperfect of the auxiliary was replaced by the compound past;
 (ii) on the other hand, they received a relational value, a discourse function, and not an aspectual perfective value. Being open-ended, they carry the expectation that other events will follow, thanks to the pragmatic value of the CP – a pan-Romance value, that is 'present relevance' (i.e., a psychological prolongation of the consequences of the event for other events).

3.2. *The miracle of the preservation of a synthetic relational tense such as the pluperfect*

The values of a relative past were also expressed by the inherited form of the pluperfect subjunctive (i.e., the forms in [se]: e.g., *lucrase* 'had-(s)he worked', *rămăsesie* 'had-(s)he remained'), which are already attested in 16th-c. texts in subordinate clauses. In most Romance languages, the Latin PPF subjunctive replaced the imperfect subjunctive. In Romanian, however, [se] was assigned the value of a PPF indicative, contrary to the pan-Romance typological tendency to express relational categories such as case or tense analytically (see Coseriu 1965, 1968)). Compare:

- (39) Fr. (*que*) *je chantasse* 'that I might/would have sung:SUBJ'

- (40) Rom. *cântasem* 'I had sung: INDIC'.

As I hope to have demonstrated elsewhere (Manoliu 1994: 299-305), the explanation has to be sought in a cluster of phenomena which led to the reinterpretation of -se forms as opposed to both the sigmatic preterite as an expression of an 'integral, terminative aspect', on the one hand, and the CP, within the pragmatic area of relevance, on the other hand.

Compare (41) and (42):

- (41) *Iar Bubuș și alții boiarii carei îl pârâsă, dac-au vădzut*
 [...] (Nec:253)
 'And B and other boyars who denounced:PPF him, when they saw:CP [...]',

where the pluperfect in the relative clause has an aspectual terminative value, but also a pragmatic value, namely the relevance of the consequences for the following past events;

- (42) *Duca-vodă atuncea șezusă la masă* (Nec: 278)
'King Duca then sat:PPF at the table',

where the pluperfect in the main clause expresses the relevance for a past moment (*atuncea* 'then') and, implicitly, rejects any idea of present relevance.

Space does not allow us to present in detail the specific factors that favored this reinterpretation. We will however mention the most important ones, namely: (a) the morphological factor, (b) the syntagmatic factor, and (c) the support offered by the sigmatic preterite, rather frequent in the 16th-c. translated texts.

3.2.1. *The morphological factor.* In Latin, -(s)se- was highly salient, since it was one of the few verbal morphemes, the boundaries of which were easily identifiable: *cantavissem/ cantavisses/ cantavisset* 'had-I/you/(s)he sung', etc. Its synchronic salience resulted in a high degree of stability, as confirmed by the fact that it has been relatively well preserved in all Romance areas.

3.2.2. *The syntagmatic factor.* As mentioned before, the high salience of the -se morpheme favored its preservation in many other Romance areas. But differences between Romanian and other Romance languages when restructuring their modal and tense systems led to a different semantic and functional reinterpretation of -se-.

(i) *Orality: An obsolete subjunctive imperfect.* As illustrated by (43), the early spread of the present subjunctive to express simultaneity in the past rendered unnecessary the assignment of an imperfective value with a subjunctive function to -se.

- (43)a. *nice vru să asculte*
not wanted-he:SP that listen-he:SUBJ/PRES
'he did not want to listen' (17th c.: Varlaam, *Cazania*: 20. 1643)

- b. *să ruga să- l*
REFL/3rd beg-he:IND/IMPF that him
facă domn
made:SUBJ/PRES king
'he was begging ... that he made him king' (18thc. Nec: 179)

(ii) *Areal* (and specifically Greek) patterns encouraged the spread of finite verb forms (the indicative or the subjunctive) in subordinate clauses instead of the infinitive.

(a) *Subjunctive instead of infinitive.* With slight variations from one Romance language to another, the infinitive requires coreferentiality between the subject of the complement clause and an NP in the main clause:

- (44) Fr. a. *je veux partir*
I want leave:INF
'I want to leave'
b. *je veux que tu partes*
I want that you leave:SUBJ/PRES
'I want you to leave'
- (45) *je lui demande de partir*
I him:ACC ask to leave:INF
'I ask him to leave'

In Romanian the subjunctive has been generalized no matter whether the subject of the complement clause is coreferential or not with an NP in the main clause (see Copceag 1961, Vulpe 1963, Rosetti 1972):

- (46) Rom. a. *ce vor vrea să caute*
what will-they want that seek-they:SUBJ/PRES
ei vor afla (CÎ:165)
they will find
'what they wanted to seek they will find',

where the subjects of 'to want' and 'to seek' are coreferential as in (44a), and

b. *vrumu să se înmulțească cuvântul* (Cî:64)
 want-we that REFL/3rd multiply:SUBJ/PRES word-the
 'we wanted for the word to multiply'

where the subjects are different, or

c. *vă rog să citiți* (Coresi, *Caz I*:162 (1564))
 you:DAT ask-I that read-you:SUBJ/PRES
 'I am asking you to read',

where the subject of the complement-clause is coreferential with the object in the main clause as in (45), but the subjunctive has replaced the infinitive.

(b) *Indicative instead of subjunctive.* As shown by early Romanian texts, the indicative has replaced the subjunctive after verbs of feeling and in final clauses introduced by *de*, initially a preposition meaning 'from'. After verbs of feeling the cause may be interpreted as a 'real event' and it then falls outside the scope of the modality imposed by the main verb. Consequently the indicative is chosen (see (47)):

(47) *ne mirăm că(cî) nu ne face Dumnezeu pe voia noastră* (Iv, *Predici*: 85)
 'we wonder why God does not act:IND/PRES according to our wish'.

In (48) *de* fulfills the role of a conjunction introducing final clauses with a verb in the indicative:

(48) *îs găsisse vreme de au spăriiat pre Doamna Ducăi-vodă* (Nec:275)
 '(he) found:PPF time to scare:CP King Duca's lady'

De can also introduce the complement clause in causative constructions:

(49) *ei făcură pre Gligorașco de trimise dorobanții*
 they made on G. to send:IND/SP soldiers
 'they made G. send the infantry' (*Let. Cant.* 1665?-1690).

3.2.3. *Morpho-semantic.* As has been shown in 3.1.1, in Middle Romanian, the synthetic preterite (SP) underwent a semantic

narrowing becoming the expression of 'an integral perspective' in reference to activities presented in fast motion as opposed to the CP, which turned into an open-ended past referring to foregrounded events presented in regular motion. When the PPF form in *-se* lost its clear-cut subjunctive value due to the cluster of negative factors described under 3.2.2, the sigmatic SP, which had been quite frequent before the 17th c., could offer morphological support (at the level of expression) and favored the integration of *-se* forms into the paradigm of indicative past tenses. If the forms in *-se* shared with their etymon, the subjunctive PPF, several contexts (mainly complement and final clauses), both being relative past tenses with a dual-reference point, the SP and the synthetic PPF shared the same temporal value of anteriority and the same aspectual close-ended perspective, since PPF refers to events taking place ending, before other events. Compare the *-se* endings of the sigmatic SP and of the synthetic PPF:

(50) a. SP: *luă* 'he took' - PPF: *luase* 'he had taken' and
 b. SP: *trimise* 'he sent' - PPF: *trimisese* 'he had sent'.

The ending *-se* either expresses the PPF only (1st, 2nd and 4th conjugations – see (50a)) or can occur in both the PPF and the SP (3rd conjugation – see (50b)).

In brief, due to the reorganization of the mood paradigm, mainly favored by areal factors, the forms in *-se* underwent a paradigmatic realignment losing their subjunctive values:

(i) on the one hand, as expressions of an integral, terminative aspect, they parallel the sigmatic SP, but the difference between them consists in a temporal characteristic, namely that the SP has a single point of reference, whereas the PPF has a dual-reference point;

(b) on the other hand, the synthetic pluperfect evolved into a temporal device as the opposite of the CP, for expressing anteriority and relevance in reference to a past event, which is entirely consistent with the Romance temporal system.¹¹

The three main Romanian subsystems, gender, case-markers, and tense, which present striking differences when compared with other Romance domains, are the result of a permanent struggle between Romance and non-Romance types. However, no matter how strong

the impact of non-Romance types has been, an 'underground' Romance tendency acted upon the grammatical system in such a way as to readjust various Romanian paradigms according to the Romance type, especially in the casual spoken register, more than in standard, academic registers which have been intentionally exposed to neo-Latin influences (mostly in the lexical domain). In our opinion, such an unintentional – unconscious – process must have been associated in various ways – which are difficult to define – with a conscious effort to preserve *ethnic identity* by all means, including the language patterns and traditional customs and folklore¹².

This amazing loyalty to the Romance type constitutes another proof that the *linguistic type* has to be regarded as a mechanism which acts both synchronically and diachronically.

Dept. of French and Italian
509 Sproul Hall
University of California
Davis CA 95616

Notes

1. In Italian, a similar type of agreement is displayed by a very reduced number of nouns namely: *paio, uovo, stajo, centinaio, migliaio, miglio, ornamento* (see Bonfante 1961).
2. For more details concerning the importance of 'agentivity' in the restructuring of Romance voice see Manoliu 1994:85-108.
3. An interesting exception to the Slavic pattern is Bulgarian, which also belongs to the Balkan area, because it has a richer tense system than the rest of its cognates, an article and clitic pronouns.
4. See also the fate of neuter plural endings in southern Italian dialects.
5. An interesting typological approach of the areal type where the declension is still alive may be found in Trubetzkoi, 1937/1966: 98: 'Gedanke über die slovakische Deklination' (see also Malkiel 1985).
6. An invariable *lu*, probably derived from the analogical dative *illo* was also frequently used in old Romanian texts and in oral registers of contemporary Romanian. *Lu* introduces indirect objects and noun complements.
7. In contemporary standard Romanian the preposition *a* has a more restrictive distribution: it occurs before undeclinable quantifiers:

<i>tată</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>trei</i>	<i>copii</i>
father:MASC/SG	A	three	children
'father of three children'			

As an indirect object marker *ad* has been reinforced by the adverbial *illac* 'there': Rom. *la*:

<i>se</i>	<i>opune</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>două</i>	<i>schimbări</i>
REFL/3rd	opposes-he	to	two	changes
'it (=this proposal) opposes two changes'				
<i>dă</i>	<i>mâncare</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>păsări</i>	
gives-(s)he	food	to	birds	
'(s)he feeds the birds'				

8. In Rosetti (1986), *al* is considered as the result of the combination of the preposition *ad* 'to' and the demonstrative *ille* 'that'. Most Romanian grammars accept Rosetti's etymology. There is, however, a major counter-argument, namely the fact that it agrees in gender and number with its controlling NP, which precedes it, and not with the possessive NP which follows. A preposition usually blocks such a backward agreement. In Ivănescu's opinion (1980) *a(l)* is probably a shorter oral variant of the demonstrative *ille*, which developed very early into a marker introducing possessive pronouns and attributes in the genitive in various conditions: (a) when the noun is preceded by an adjective or by a possessive determiner; (b) when it is separated from its head noun by a copulative conjunction (and then it has a pronominal value); (c) when it introduces a secondary definite description. Recent syntactic approaches are also controversial. For Grosu (1988), *al* is a preposition which assigns a genitive case to the following NP, in the same way as other Romanian prepositions: namely, *contra* (*ta*) 'against (you)' or *împrejurul* (*tău*) 'around you'. Cornilescu (1992) argues in favor of a pronominal interpretation, namely that *al* is a compound of an anaphoric *A* referring to the head NP and a definite article assigning a genitive case to the controlled noun (see also Manoliu 1965).
9. Within the framework of a speaker-centered model, in the same line of thought as Tasmowski, Halvorsen (1994) considers that *pe* is a marker of informative salience. It is worth mentioning the fact that pragmatic and discourse explanations have been also advanced in order to explain the spread of the preposition *a(d)* before direct objects referring to inanimates in Spanish: cf. *la nieve cubre a Madrid* 'the snow covers (prep. *a*) Madrid' (see King 1984 and Weissenrieder 1985, 1990).
10. Even a double-compound form such as Fr. *j'ai eu chanté*, replacing in some areas the past anterior (e.g. *j'eus chanté*) in temporal clauses, with the aim of expressing immediate anteriority, can be accounted for by the oral preference

for the compound past (*passé composé*), which has eliminated the simple past, rather than by the so-called necessity for a new perfective marker. Interesting enough, according to Price (1975: 230-231), the French double-compound forms are considered as expressions focussing on the time interval, since they appear in main clauses, together with temporal adverbials, most frequently with *vite* 'fast': for example, *Ils avaient eu vite tourné le câble autour des bittes* (Vercel) could be paraphrased as 'il leur avait fallu peu de temps pour achever de fixer les câbles autour des bittes'.

11. French pluperfect may take on a similar pragmatic function: e.g. *Vous n'aviez pas dit à monsieur Albert que c'était une garde-malade qu'il vous fallait* (Queneau, *Les fleurs bleues*: 213) 'you didn't tell:PPF Mr. Albert that it was a nurse that you needed:IMPF.'; see also Grevisse 1975: 730:

Le plus-que parfait s'emploie parfois avec la valeur d'un parfait pour exprimer un fait passé par rapport au moment présent; dans ce cas, le moment présent est en quelque sorte considéré comme déjà tombé dans le passé.

12. A few years ago I was told by a specialist in European folklore that Romanian folk songs and dances are among the most authentic and best-preserved in Europe.

References

- Bonfante, Giuliano. 1961. Esiste il neutro in italiano? *Quaderni dell' Istituto di Glottologia* 6. 103-110.
- Boone, A. 1987. Les constructions 'Il est linguiste/ c'est un linguiste', *Langue française* 75. 94-106.
- Bosson, Georg. 1991. Differential Object Marking in Romance and Beyond, in Dieter Wanner and Douglas A. Kibbee (eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics*, Selected papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Urbana-Champaign, April 7 - 9, 1988. 143-170, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Cârstea-Romaşanu, Mihaela. 1970. Les types de substantifs en roumain, in *Quelques remarques sur la flexion nominale romane*, 15-22, ed. by M. Manoliu-Manea, Bucharest: Publications de la Société Roumaine de Linguistique Romane.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 1992. Remarks on the Determiner System of Rumanian: the Demonstratives al and cel. *Probus* 4.3. 189-260.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 1993. Remarks on the determiner system of Romanian: the demonstratives. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 38. 69-87.

- Cornu, J. 1953. *Les forms surcomposées en français*, Berne.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1952. Sisteam, norma y habla, *Revista de la Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias*, Montevideo. 113-117.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1958. Sincronía, diacronía e historia. El problema del cambio lingüístico, Montevideo (see also 1978³: Madrid: Gredos).
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1968. Sincronía, Diacronía y Tipología, *Actas del XIo Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología románicas*, Madrid: C.S.I.C.
- Coteanu, Ion. 1969. Româna comună. II. Morfologia 1. Substantivul, in *Istoria Limbii Române* 2. ed. by Al. Rosetti, Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Dardel, Robert de and Jakob Wüest. 1993. Les systèmes casuels du protoroman. Les deux cycles de simplification, *Vox Romanica* 52. 25-65.
- Densusianu, Ovid. 1961 *Istoria limbii române*, 1-2 (ed. by Jack Byck), Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică.
- Diaconescu, Paula. 1964. Le nombre et le genre du substantif roumain, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 9.2. 171-193.
- Diaconescu, Paula. 1970. Structură şi evoluţie în morfologia substantivului românesc, Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1993. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Comparative Studies in Romance [Studies in Generative Grammar], Berlin/New York: Mouton/de Gruyter.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1983. From Pragmatics to Grammar. Diachronic Reflections on Complex Pasts and Futures in Romance, *Lingua* 60. 183-214.
- Fleischman, Suzanne and Linda Waugh (eds.). 1991. *Discourse Pragmatics and the Verb*. The Evidence from Romance, London: Routledge.
- Graur, Al(exandru). 1945. Contributions à l'étude du genre personnel en roumain, *Bulletin Linguistique* 13. 97-104.
- Graur, Al. 1954. Genul neutru în româneşte, *Limba Română* 3.1. 30-44.
- Graur, Al. 1957. Discuţii în jurul genului neutru, *Vox Romanica* 10.5. 147-150.
- Graur, Al. (ed.). 1963-1966. *Gramatica limbii române*. 1 (1963) - 2 (1966), Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Graur, Al. 1965. *La romanité du roumain*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Graur, Al. 1968. *Tendenţe actuale ale limbii române*, Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică.
- Grosu, Alexandru. 1988. On the Distribution of Genitive Phrases in Romanian, *Linguistics* 26. 931-949.
- Hall, Robert Jr. 1965. The 'neuter' in Romance: a pseudo-problem, *Word* 21. 421-427.

- Harris, Martin. 1978. *The Evolution of French Syntax. A Comparative Approach*, London/New York: Longman.
- Halvorsen, Arne. 1994. Le pronom neutre *asta* et le marquage de l'objet en roumain. *Am trăit s-o vedem și pe asta!* *Revue Romane* 29.2. 173-194.
- Holtus, Gunter. 1986. L'emploi des formes surcomposées dans les variétés linguistiques du français et l'attitude des grammairiens in *Morphosyntaxe des langues romanes. Actes du XVIIe Congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes, Aix-en-Provence, 29 août - 3 septembre 1983*, 4. 423-437, Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence/ Lafitte.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1982. Aspect between discourse and grammar: an introductory essay for the volume, in *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics, Containing the Contributions to a Symposium on Tense and Aspect, held at UCLA, May, 1979*. ed. by Paul J. Hopper, 3-17, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Ivănescu, Gheorghe. 1957. Soarta neutruului latin clasic în latina populară și în limbile romanice, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 8.3. 299-314.
- Ivănescu, Gheorghe. 1980. *Istoria limbii române*, Iași: Editura Junimea.
- King, Larry D. 1984. The semantics of Direct Object A in Spanish, *Hispania* 67: 397-403.
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1985. Old and New Problems in the Latinity of the Lower Danube, *Journal of the American-Romanian Academy of Arts and Sciences* 6/7. 90-104.
- Manoliu, Maria. 1965. Articolul posesiv în româna contemporană, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice*, 15.1. 69-76.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1970. Un micro-modèle du genre roumain, *Revue Romane* 4 (numéro spécial). 96-107.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1985. Genetic Type versus Areal Coherence: Rumanian case markers and the definite articles, in Deanovic et al. (eds.), *Mélanges linguistiques dédiés à la mémoire de Petar Skok (1881-1956)*, Zagreb: Académie Yougoslave des Sciences et des Arts: 301-308.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1988. Verbal Complementation and Discourse Strategies. Direct-Object Constructions in Romanian, *International Journal of Rumanian Studies* 6.2: 53-68.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1990. The Ghost of the Agent, in *Selected Papers from the 8th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Lille, France, August 31 - September 4, 1987*, ed. by Andersen, H. and K. Koerner, 327-338, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1990. French Neuter demonstratives: Evidence for a pragma-semantic definition of pronouns, in *Variation and Change in French* ed. by John Green and Wendy Ayres-Bennet, 89-115, London/New York: Routledge.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1993. Genetic Congruence versus Areal Convergence: The misfortune of Lat.AD in Romanian, in *Historical Linguistics* 19 (in press).
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1994. *Discourse and Pragmatic Constraints on Grammatical Choices*, [North Holland Linguistics series 57], Elsevier: Amsterdam.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1921 (1) – 1937 (2). *Linguistique historique et générale*, Paris: Champion.
- Meillet, Antoine & Joseph Vendryes. 1960. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, 3e édition revue et comp. par J. Bedryes, Paris: Champion.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1906¹. *Grammaire des langues romanes* 3. *Syntaxe*, French translation by A. Doutrepoint et Georges Doutrepoint, New York/Leipzig/London/Paris: Stechert & Co. (1923²).
- Niculescu, Alexandru. 1965. Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice. *Contribuții gramaticale*, Bucharest: Editura Științifică.
- Niculescu, Alexandru. 1981. *Outline History of the Romanian Language*, Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Ojeda, Almerindo. 1993. *Linguistic Individuals* [CSLI lecture notes, 31], Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1993. Non-topical Human Agents in Romance: A Historical and Pragmatic Approach. in *Hommages offerts à Maria Manoliu-Manea*: 100-121, ed. by C. Lupu and G. Price, Bucharest: Pluralia/Logos.
- Price, Glanville. 1975. *The French Language: Present and Past*, London: Arnold
- Rohrer, Christian. 1986. L'analyse des temps du verbe dans un texte narratif, in *Morphosyntaxe des langues romanes*, cit.: 439-451.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1950. Neutru în română, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 1.1. 233-235.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1957. Despre genul neutru și genul personal în limba română, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 8.4. 407-415.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1964. Sur la catégorie du neutre, in *Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Linguists, Cambridge, Mass. 1962*: 779-783, The Hague: Mouton.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1968. Sur le neutre en roumain, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 13.1. 3-10.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1972. Cu privire la tendința înlocuirii infinitivului cu conjunctivul în limba română, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 23.3. 307-308.

- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1975. Pour le 'neutre' roumain, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 20.4. 401-402.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1986. *Istoria limbii române. I. De la origini pînă la începutul secolului al XVII-lea*, Bucharest: Editura Științifică.
- Rusu, Valeriu (ed.). 1984. *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Institutul de Cercetări Etnologice și Dialectologice, Craiova: Scrisul Românesc.
- Tasmowski De Ryck, Liliane. 1987. La reduplication clitique en roumain, in *Akten der Theodor-Gartner Tagung (Rätoromanisch und Rumänisch) in Vill/Innsbruck, 1985*, ed. by Plangg, G. A. and M. Iliescu, 377-399, Innsbruck (Institut für Romanistik of Leopold-Franzens-Universität): Universitätsverlag.
- Vasilii, Emanuel K. 1953. Observații asupra flexiunii nominale în limba română, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 4.127-148.
- Vasilii, Emanuel K. 1960. Observații asupra categoriei genului în limba română, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 11.3. 769-770.
- Veissenrieder, Maureen. 1985. Exceptional Uses of the Accusative a, *Hispania* 68. 393-398
- Veissenrieder, Maureen. 1990. Variable Uses of the Direct-Object Marker A, *Hispania* 73.223-230.

Corpora

- Cl: Diaconul Coresi, Carte cu învățătură (1580? - 1581), publicată de Sextil Pușcariu și Alexie Procopovici, 1. Textul, Bucharest: Socec and Co., 1914.
- Coresi, Caz 1: Diaconul Coresi, *Cazania I (1564)* in *Crest. rom.*: 162-163
- Crest. Rom*: Crestomație romanică, întocmită sub conducerea Acad. Iorgu Iordan de M. Avram, N. Dănăilă, Fl. Dimitrescu, V. Guțu-Romalo, M. Iliescu, L. Macarie, C. Maneca, M. Manoliu, Al. Niculescu, M. Sala, F. Sădeanu, S. Stavrescu, M. Teodorescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei 1 (1962), 2 (1965).
- CT: Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi, Brașov (1560-1561), comparat cu *Evangeliarul lui Radu de la Mănăcești, 1574*, ed. by Florica Dimitrescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1963.
- CV: Codicele Voronețean, ediție critică, studiu filologic și studiu lingvistic de Mariana Costinescu, Bucharest: Minerva, 1981 [15th c.-16th c.].
- Iv, Predici: Antim Ivireanul, *Predici*, ediție critică, studiu introductiv și glosar de G. Ștrempel, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1962 [1690-1716, first published in 1781].

- Let: *Istoria Țării Românești 1290-1690. Letopiseșul Cantacuzinesc*, in *Crest. Rom* 1:54.
- MCU: Mihail Moxa. *Cronica universală. Ediție critică, însoțită de izvoare, studiu introductiv, note și indici de G. Mihăilă*, București: Minerva, 1989 [1620].
- Nec: Ion Neculce, *Opere. Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei și O samă de cuvinte*, ediție critică și studiu introductiv de Gabriel Ștrempel, Bucharest: Minerva, 1982 [18th c.].
- Ur: Grigore Ureche, *Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei. Texte stabilite, studiu introductiv și glosar de Liviu Onu*, Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1967 [16th c.].
- Va: Varlaam, *Opere (alcătuire, transcriere a textelor, note și comentarii, glosar și bibliografie de Manole Neagu)*, Chișinău: Hyperion, 1991 (Carte cu învățătură [Sermons], 1643; letters, 1618-1662) see also *Cazania 1643* in *Crest. Rom.* 2. 18-22.