THE GRAMMATICALIZATION OF THE FUTURE TENSE FORMS IN 16TH CENTURY ROMANIAN

DANA NICULESCU[1]

Abstract. The paper researches the competition between the various future paradigms in 16th century Romanian. It is especially concerned with the possibility of the extinct gerundial future to express aspectual features such as progressiveness and iteration. The article also investigates the process of grammaticalization of each 16th century future form, on the path from obligation to future tense (for the *have* form) and from future inflection to epistemic modality mark (for the *want* forms).

This article investigates the 16th century future tense system of Romanian from a typological perspective. The research will be diachronic, attempting to clarify aspects regarding the use of the future forms in the 16th century, their frequency, and whether they had already developed a modal meaning in the first Romanian texts that are attested. The study is carried out on basis of a large corpus, consisting out of 14 translated texts and 2 collections of original texts of the 16th century. For specific purposes, a supplementary corpus was analysed, consisting of 6 volumes of the DRH collection of original 17th century Romanian texts.

The main objective of this study is to follow the grammaticalization process of the auxiliaries *a vrea* and *a avea* from lexical meaning to future tense inflection and, finally, to modality mark in Romanian (in the case of *a vrea*). The article will analyse at which stage of grammaticalization the various future forms are in the 16th century.

Special attention will be given to the extinct gerundial future paradigm, in order to determine the meaning of the future form which incorporates the gerund and whether it was used in the 16th century as an aspectual variant of the infinitival future, or its occurrence is entirely due to the literal translation from Hungarian or Church Slavonic.

Key-words: Grammaticalization, Future Tense, Epistemic Modality, Old Romanian.

1. THE 16TH CENTURY FUTURE TENSE SYSTEM

Four future tense forms occur in the 16th century texts. Two main paradigms can be distinguished according to the future auxiliary: the future forms employing *a vrea* 'to want' as auxiliary and the future using *a avea* 'to have'. Next to the simple future, 16th century Romanian also displays the future perfect, formed with the conjugated future auxiliary *a vrea* 'to want'+ perfect auxiliary *fi* 'be' + past participle of the verb, these last two with invariant form.

[1] University of Amsterdam, d.i.niculescu@uva.nl.

This paper is supported by the Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), financed from the European Social Fund and by the Romanian Government under the contract number SOP HRD/89/1.5/S/59758.

RRL, **LVI**, *4*, p. 421–440, Bucureşti, 2011

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

FUTURE	
I. Auxiliary *a vrea* 'want'	**II. Auxiliary *a avea* 'have'**
a. *a vrea* + infinitive (infinitival future) *voi dormi* shall.1 sleep.INF 'I shall sleep'	a. *a avea* + infinitive (*have* future) *am a dormi* have.1 A sleep.INF 'I shall sleep'
b. *a vrea* + subjunctive (subjunctive future) *voi să dorm* shall.1 SĂ sleep.SBJV 'I shall sleep'	
c. *a vrea* + *'fi'* + gerund (gerundial future) *voi fi dorm-ind* shall.1 be sleep.GER 'I shall sleep/I shall be sleeping'	

FUTURE PERFECT
a. *a vrea* + *fi* + past participle of verb *voi fi dormi-t* shall.1 be sleep. PST.PRT 'I shall have slept'

The infinitival future and the future perfect are preserved with this form in contemporary Romanian. The subjunctive future under (I.b) will decrease in frequency in the 18th century and will eventually disappear, as the variable auxiliary will be replaced with the invariable form *o,* used for all the six persons: *eu* ***o să vin****/tu* ***o să vii*** etc. The gerundial future loses its future tense reference in the 17th century, but the form survives with epistemic modal use in contemporary Romanian. The *have* future will also decrease in frequency in the 17th century, when a competing form appears. i.e. a future form with the auxiliary *a avea,* but where the infinitive is replaced by the subjunctive (*am să vin* 'I shall come'). It will eventually disappear from literary Romanian, surviving only in the Moldavian sub-dialect (Dimitrescu 1978: 315).

1.1. The rise of the (Old) Romanian future tense paradigms

The Romanian future tense paradigms originate in structures involving lexical verbs that express desire (*a vrea* 'to want') and possession (*a avea* 'to have'), which undergo a change of meaning through repeated inferences. According to Bybee *et al.* (1994), the use of a verb of desire, such as *a vrea,* in the first person creates the implication of intention. If one desires to do something, it implies that one intends to do it. Through further inference, intention leads to

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

prediction: an intention is expected to be put into practice, so the speaker can predict that someone will act in a certain way. Both the intention and the prediction uses of the verb *a vrea* belong to the sphere of futurity.

In the case of the verb *a avea* 'to have', its grammaticalization path includes one intermediate step between its lexical use and its use as a mark of the speaker's intention. The possessive verb undergoes a grammaticalization process to become a deontic modality mark (of obligation). First person *a avea* expressing obligation is reinterpreted as a mark of intention, by inference: if someone has an obligation to do something, we can infer that one has also the intention of doing it (Bybee *et al.* 1994, Auwera, Plungian 1998). By inference, through the same process as in the case of *a vrea,* we arrive at the meaning of prediction.

(1) *a vrea* ('want')*:* Desire – Intention – Prediction
(2) *a avea* ('have'): Possession – Obligation – Intention - Prediction

These grammaticalization paths are followed by a number of languages belonging to different families. Path (1) can be found in Romance languages such as Romanian, Germanic languages (English), Slavic languages (Serbo-Croatian), also in Mandarin, or Swahili (Bybee and Dahl 1989). Path (2) is typical for Romance languages (Romanian, French, Italian, Spanish).

1.2. The infinitival future

The simple infinitival future is the most common expression of futurity in 16th century Romanian, both in original and translated texts. It occurs with the two main uses of the future: intention use (3a: *vă vrem da*) and pure prediction use (3b: *va muri*). In some contexts, the meaning of the infinitival future is harder to pinpoint. For example, the other two future forms below, *va aduce* and *dezlega-se-va,* are ambiguous between a use which encodes the intention of the subject and a use which expresses a prediction made by the speaker.

(3) a. *Derept aceea şi acmu avem om acolo, de ne va aduce vr'o veaste **vă vrem da** a şti.* Lettres B Sălişte (Maramureş), 1593
'This is why we have a man there now, if he **brings** us any news we **shall let** you know.'
b. *E să **va muri** bărbatul ei, dezlega-se-va den legea bărbatului.* CPr.: 241
'[…] but if her husband **dies** she **is discharged** from the law concerning the husband.' NT *Romans* 7:2

In Biblical texts, the future can acquire a supplementary performative function, in those passages which reproduce the words of God. Such future contexts lack the element of uncertainty which is specific to a prediction; moreover, they become fact at the moment of utterance (4a,b).

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

(4) a. *17. Şi lui Adam zise: căce că ascultaşi glasul muieriei tale şi ai mâncat den lemn den care porâncii ţie să nu mânânci, blăstemat pământul, în lucrul tău cu nevoie te hrăneşte dentr-însu în viaţa ta. 18. Spini şi urzici să rodească şi* ***veri mânca*** *iarba câmpului. 19. În sudorile feaţiei tale* ***veri mânca*** *pâinea ta, până când te* ***veri turna*** *iară în pământ den care eşti luat, că eşti pământ şi iară* ***pământ veri fi****.* PO: 20-21
'And to Adam he said, "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you, `You shall not eat of it,' cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life; thorns and thistles it shall bring forth to you; and **you shall eat** the plants of the field. In the sweat of your face **you shall eat** bread till you **return** to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust **you shall return**."' OT, Book I, 3: 17-19
b. *Derept aceaia de acmu înainte* ***nu te veri chiema*** *Avram, ce numele tau* ***Avraam va fi*** *[...]* PO: 53
'No longer **shall** your name **be** Abram, but your name **shall be** Abraham' OT, Book I, 17: 5

Degree of grammaticalization

The infinitival future is the most grammaticalized future form in the 16th century. Only translated 16th century texts show the possibility for different constituents to intervene between the auxiliary and the infinitive. There are few examples in the selected corpus, which can mean that the structure is literally taken over from the Slavic original text (5, 6).

(5) *Ce folos e omului să* ***va*** *şi toată lumea* ***dobândi*** *şi sufletulu-ş* ***piiarde****?* CC^2: 72
'For what does it profit a man, **to gain** the whole world and **forfeit** his life?' NT, *Mark* 8:36

(6) *Multă fu plângere tuturoru şi căzu spre cerbicea lu Pavel, săruta elu, jeluiia mai de cuvîntul ce zise că* ***nu*** *mai multu* ***voru*** *faţa lui* ***vedea****.* CB: 222
'And they all wept and embraced Paul and kissed him, sorrowing most of all because of the word he had spoken, that **they should see** his face no more.' NT *Acts* 20: 37-8

In example (5) above, two infinitives that are part of the future tense structure are coordinated. This is not possible in contemporary Romanian (****va dobândi*** *lumea şi* ***pierde*** *sufletul*). The possibility to coordinate the two infinitives can be a sign that the inflectional element *va* is still felt as a head which is capable of taking complements, the same way as the lexical verb *a vrea.* It can also be just a reproduction of the Slavic text.

In 16th century Romanian, the verb *a vrea,* with its lexical and functional use, is followed by a short infinitive (without the inflectional head *a*), which can create ambiguities as to the role of *a vrea* in some contexts. In the 16th century, the verb *a*

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

vrea has the same forms for both its lexical and grammatical use. With its lexical use, it allows for a short infinitive complement to follow it (7), although a subjunctive is more common (8). In the 16th century, the lexical *a vrea* shares the same type of complement with the future auxiliary.

(7) *Că ceaia ce zace a mijloc şi aiavea, nimea n-**au vrut întreba** nici dininoară* [...] CC[2]: 301
'For also before nobody **wanted to** inquire about the one that is in the middle and is real'

(8) *Deci m-au prinsu neşte sasi, deci a**<u> vrut să mă taie**.* DÎ, CIV, Bistrița 1600
'So some Saxons caught me, and they **wanted to stab me**.'

1.3. The subjunctive future

The subjunctive future is quite infrequent in 16th century texts. It has seven occurrences in *Palia de la Orăştie* (PO) and eight in *Documente şi însemnări* (DÎ). It occurs more frequently in CC[2] (in more than a hundred contexts). There seems to be no difference between translated and original works as far as its use is concerned. This type of future is attested with both intention and prediction use. The prediction use is non-ambiguous in contexts such as (9), where there is an inanimate subject present. In contexts such as (10), intention is one of the interpretations that can be given to the future form, next to prediction. Moreover, another ambiguity arises in example (10): *a vrea* can be said to function here as a future tense auxiliary, but it can also be interpreted as a lexical verb, with its original meaning of desire ('to want'), (since *a vrea* has the same forms for both its lexical and grammatical use). In context (11), the verb *a vrea* has a clear lexical meaning.

(9) *Chemară Pavel şi auziră el de ce e întru Hristos Isus credință, grăi el de dereptate şi de ținut şi de județ ce **va să fie**.* CPr: 119-20
'and he sent for Paul and heard him speak upon faith in Christ Jesus. And as he argued about justice and self-control and future judgment [and the judgment that **will take place**] […]' NT *Acts* 24: 24-25

(10) *Şi acum iară de alta vă dămu în ştire, că acumu Mihaiu vodă, dec-au spartu țeara, elu acum **va să fugă** cu acei hoți ci ține.* DÎ, XVIII, Târgovişte [1599]
'And now we inform you about something else, that, after obtaining the victory over the country, Prince Mihai **will/wants to run away** with those thieves that accompany him.'

(11) *Iară alalți carei-s nedestoinici taineei, şi nice caută, nici **vor să ştie**, întunecat le se grăiaşte, şi le pare că caută, şi nu văd, şi aud, şi nu înțeleg.* CC[2]: 396

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

'And to the others that are not worthy of the sacred meanings and neither seek, nor **want to know**, the words will remain incomprehensible; and it will seem to them that they seek, but they do not see, and do not hear and do not understand.'

Degree of grammaticalization of the structure

The subjunctive future shows a lower degree of grammaticalization than the simple infinitive future. In translated 16th century texts it was possible to introduce a constituent between the auxiliary *a vrea* and the subjunctive verb form, either a subject DP, as in (12: *aceasta* 'this') and (13: *el* 'he'), or an adjunct PP in (14: *după firea omenească* 'as a man would'). The insertion of a phrase between the auxiliary and the subjunctive form is disallowed by the later subjunctive future with invariable auxiliary (**o **aceasta** să fie*). This unusual and infrequent 16th century word order in subjunctive future structures could indicate the lower degree of grammaticalization of the structure or it could reflect the original word order of the Slavic text.

The subjunctive future with variable auxiliary, as well as the form with invariable auxiliary that will replace it, display the same position of the pronominal clitics (*le* 'them'), i.e. between the functional element *să* and the verb (14: *va după firea omenească să **le** ajute lor,* 15*: voiu să **le** las*). The placement of the clitics lower than *să* is proof that *să* still retains complementizer features. The infinitival future does not allow this positioning of the clitics in 16th century Romanian or at a later stage (**voi **le** lăsa*). Even if we admit that only this last word order phenomenon is an internal evolution of Romanian, we can conclude that the degree of boundness between the morphemes entering this future tense structure is lower than that of the infinitival future.

(12) *[...] preuții şi voivozii beseareciei şi vlădicii **nu se precepea de ei ce, amu, va** aceasta **să fie**.* CPr: 20
'Now when the captain of the temple and the chief priests heard these words, they were much perplexed about them, wondering what this **would come to**.' NT *Acts* 5: 24

(13) *şi ceia ce i se închina lui, părea-le lor că cu împărăție de pre ceastă lume **va** el **să împărățească** spre ei, că aştepta să se scoale un împărat mai bun şi mai mare.* CC[2]: 110
'and to those that believed in him, it seemed that he **will reign** over them with a worldly reign, as they were waiting for a better and greater ruler to appear.'

(14) *Aşa le părea lor de Domnul Hristos, că **va** după firea omenească **să** le **ajute** lor; gândiia ei că de supt mâinile şi ținutul rimleanilor va scumpăra pre ei şi le va dărui slobozie.* CC[2]: 110-111
'This is what they thought of the Lord, that he **would help** them as a man would; they thought that he would win back their freedom from the Romans.'

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

(15) *14 răspunsure: încă iară rog pre domneta Mihail voievod păntru acea ţară, să nu se strice întru viaţa domnetale, şi ceasta a împărăţiei meale, ce să fie amândouo una, în viaţa domnetale; că eu* ***voiu să le las*** *să fie pre voie domnetale, ca să cunoşti cum este mai bine, să fie tot după domneta*. DÎ, XXXII, 1600
'14 answers: I am asking you Prince Mihai again in the matter of that country, do not let it be destroyed during your rule, and in the matter of my country, let them unite, while you are prince; and **I want to let** it all be as you wish, you know what is best, be it all as you wish.'

1.4. The gerundial future

This future form is very rare in the 16th century, occurring in only seven translated texts, and in no original text. The texts are *Tetraevanghelul* (The Gospels), *Tâlcul Evangheliilor* (The Interpretation of the Gospels 1), *Evanghelia cu învăţătură* (The Interpretation of the Gospels 2) and *Pravila* (Code of Laws, TR), published by Deacon Coresi, *Palia de la Orăştie* (The Old Testament), *Glosele Bogdan* (The Bogdan Glosses, TR), and *Leviticul* (Leviticus) (Ch. 26, verses 3-41, cca. 1560) edited by B.P. Hasdeu in his study *Cuvente den bătrâni,* I (1983: 79-80). Its scarcity and sometimes inappropriate use have lead to the claim that it reproduces a similar construction from the original Slavonic or Hungarian text (Rădulescu 1960, Edelstein 1966).

(16) *iară să mie nu* ***veţi hi îngăduindu*** *şi nu veţi face toote porăncelele mele, şi să* ***veţi hi urându*** *aceste porănci ale mele, şi sufletul vostru* ***va fi lepădându*** *lege me, şi legătura me o veţi lepăda, eu încă aćasta voiu face cu voi […]* Hasdeu, CB I: 79
'But if **you will not hearken** to me, and will not do all these commandments, if **you spurn** my statutes, and if your soul **abhors** my ordinances, so that you will not do all my commandments, but break my covenant, I will do this to you:' OT, Book III, 26: 14-16

No gerundial future is present in the 16th century original texts that were part of the corpus. One explanation is that the gerundial future did not exist in 16th century Romanian, but this claim is too strong. The number of original 16th century texts is too low to draw any conclusion. The fact that the structure occurs in translated texts is not a sufficient argument to claim that it is copied from the Slavonic or Hungarian original text. As we see below (32), there are examples in which the gerundial future occurs in the Romanian translation, but not in the original text.

We can argue that the gerundial future did circulate in 16th century Romanian, and was not just a translation, even if it is not attested. The gerundial future form occurs in two original letters from the first half of the 17th century, written in 1627

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

and 1634, respectively (DRH AXIX: 358-359 and DRH BXXIV: 267-268). In both examples that were found, the gerundial future has modal use. Below, one of these two contexts is given (17), where the verb *va hi avîndu* has present tense reference.

(17) *Dat-am cartea domnii meli slugilor noastre, lui Drăgan aprod şi lui Ifrim stol[nicel] din Zmiiani, spre-acéia ca să hie tari şi puternici cu cartea domnii méle a-ş ţinea şi a apăra a lor direaptă ocină şi cumpărătură din sat din Zmiiani şi din Bălăceni părţile lui Gligorie şi a surori-sa Sofroniei, feciori Grozavei, nepoţii lui Gherman, din moară şi din tot locul, nemărui să nu dea nemic dintr-acéle parţi. Iar cine va avea vr-o strâmbătate dereptu acea părţi de ocină să vie de faţă înnaintea domnii méle şi să-şi aducă şi derése ce **va hi avându** pre acéle părţi de ocină*. DRH AXIX: 358-359

'I gave this letter to my servants, the bailiff Drăgan and the nobleman Ifrim from Zmiiani, to reinforce their rights on their land and on the purchase of the property of Gligorie and of his sister Sofronia, Grozava's children, Gherman's grandsons, which they had in the villages of Zmiiani and in Bălăceni, at the mill, and everywhere else; they do not owe any piece of it to anyone. And whoever has claim on those pieces of land shold come in front of me and he should bring the documents that he **might have** for it.'

If the gerundial future already had a modal function at the beginning of the 17th century, it is likely that the structure was in use at that time, as an epistemic modality mark. The future tense use preceded the epistemic use, which leads us to believe that the gerundial future existed as a future mark in the 17th century. Moreover, it could have had both functions as early as 16th century Romanian, or it could have had at least its original future tense use.

Degree of grammaticalization

As far as the degree of boundness of this future tense expression is concerned, we can notice that the three verbal elements do form one syntactic unit. This is proven by the impossibility to insert other constituent between the two auxiliaries and the gerund (16), on the one hand, and by the position of the pronominal clitic in (32), on the other hand. Normally, in a gerundial structure, the clitic occupies a low position, at the right of the gerund (*aşteptându-**l***). However, in example (32), in section 3.2, (*nu-**l** va fi aşteptându*), it occupies a high position in the Inflectional Phrase, at the left of the highest auxiliary. This position is typical for elements that cliticize on finite verb forms (*nu-**l** voi aştepta* 'I shall not wait for him').

Next to these contexts in which the gerundial structure clearly forms one syntactic unit, the corpus contains two ambiguous examples, in which the DP subject is placed between the auxiliaries and the gerund (18a,b) below (18a: *şi sfinţi şi drepţi* 'both saints and righteous men', 18b: *omul,* here 'a man'). These less grammaticalized constructions reveal the process by which two syntactic units, one

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

with the function of head of the VP and the other, its adjunct, were reanalysed as one constituent. The gerund *zăcând* 'lying' in (18.a), as well as *cerşând* 'begging' in (18.b), are ambiguous between an interpretation as secondary predicates and as being part of the future tense form.

(18) a. *Că cum dentr-aceastea auziți fi-văm, aşijderea şi fără aceastea neauziți fi-văm, să **vor fi** şi sfinți şi derepți **cerşând**. Cine amu fu mai derept decât Pavel, ce, derept căce cerşu ce era fără de folos, neauzit fu?* CC^2: 356-7
'Because we shall be heard in this matter, but without this [if our claims are futile] we shall remain unheard, even if there **are** saints and righteous men **asking** / even if saints and righteous men **ask**. Who was now more righteous than Paul? When he asked for something that was futile he was not heard.'
b. *[...] şi iar nu se cade popeei să poarte cumenecătura acasă sau într-alt loc, ca să o ia oamenii la besearecă să-i cumeneci. Iar, de **va fi** omul **zăcând** spre moarte, cade-se popeei să ia cumenecătura cu frică şi să meargă înainte sveaşnicul şi cădelnița.* CPrav., TR: 223
'[…] and the priest should not take the sacramental bread to his house of to another place, as people should receive it in church when you [the priest] celebrate the Eucharist. And if a man **is lying** to die/**is dying**, the priest should take the sacramental bread with care and should go to him with a candelabrum and censer in front of him.'

1.5. Future perfect

The future perfect, as well as other perfect tenses (the perfect subjunctive and the perfect conditional), rarely occurs in 16th century Romanian. While some authors consider that its appearance in Romanian is due to the Slavic (Bulgarian) influence (Sandfeld 1930: 149), the future perfect is now assumed to be a Romanian future form (Dimitrescu 1978: 291). The future perfect is attested in both original and translated 16th century texts which make up the corpus (DÎ; CC^2, CP, CTd, CB, PO). In the translated texts that were analysed, it occurs with its original value, that of future perfect (19, 20), referring to an event which is anterior to another future event.

(19) *E noi ainte de-acea până nu **va fi apropiat** de el gata să fim să-l ucidem el.* CPr: 113
'And we are ready to kill him before he **comes near**.' NT *Acts* 23: 15

(20) *Rugăciunea credenței mântuiaşte lângedul şi-l rădică elu Domnul. Şi se păcatu **fi-va faptu**, lăsa-se-va lui.* CB: 294
'[…] and the prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he **has committed** sins, he will be forgiven.' NT, *James* 5: 15

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

1.6. The future with *have*

The future which employs the auxiliary *a avea* 'to have' (*am a face*) is less frequent in 16th century texts than the future with *a vrea* (*voi face*). It has only eight occurrences in CPr and six in DÎ.

In the selected corpus, there are contexts in which the future meaning is clear; both examples (21) and (22) are from translated texts.

(21) *Şi aşa slava lu Dumnezeu **are a acoperi** pre noi, mai vârtos de tot nuorul cela luminatul umbri-ne-va.* CC[2]: 600
'And so the glory of God **will come upon** us, stronger than all the clouds that light will shadow us.'

(22) *E să te veri însura, nu greşeşti; şi de se va mărita, fata nu greşaşte. Întristare trupurile lor **au a începe** acelora.* CPr: 304
'But if you marry, you do not sin, and if a girl marries she does not sin. Yet those who marry **will have** [will begin] worldly troubles […]' NT *Corinthians* 7: 28

Degree of grammaticalization

The 16th century *have* future paradigm is less grammaticalized than the infinitival future form. This is shown by the use of the long infinitive form of the verb (which includes the inflectional infinitive mark *a*), as opposed to its non-occurrence in the infinitival future paradigm. Secondly, the auxiliary *have* retains the same form as the lexical verb, while, for example, in the past tense paradigm, it suffers a phonetic reduction (*noi **am** făcut* vs. *noi **avem** a face*).

2. THE COMPETITION BETWEEN FUTURE TENSE FORMS IN 16TH CENTURY ROMANIAN. THE SPECIAL CASE OF THE GERUNDIAL FUTURE

In 16th century Romanian there are four competing future paradigms, with different frequencies of occurrence. They are either inherited from Latin (the infinitival future, the *have* future) or formed in Romanian (the subjunctive future). The gerundial future could be inherited from the Latin active periphrastic conjugation, although its low frequency is a counterargument (Dimitrescu 1978: 316). This section investigates which are the factors that lead to the choice of one of the four future forms.

One paradigm, the infinitival future, is the non-marked future form, by far the most frequent in the researched corpus. The oscillation between the infinitival and the subjunctive future paradigms is explained by the tendency to replace the infinitive with a subjunctive in Romanian in control contexts. This tendency was still very weak in the 16th century, as we can see by comparing the frequency of the

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

two future structures (see 1.3). The competition between the *will* and the *have* future has a historical explanation. The two future auxiliaries are attested in Latin and they were inherited by Romanian, with a strong tendency towards using *will* over *have.* The deontic origin of the *have* future form is still visible in the 16th century texts, as it is used almost always with human subjects. This can render the context ambiguous between the future and deontic modality reading, as seen below (34). In three texts in the corpus (DÎ, CPr, and CC^2), only seven *have* future contexts were identified in which the subject is inanimate (23).

(23) […] *nici ştim* ***ce are a fi*** *până demâneaţă!* CC^2: 450
'[…] nor do we know what will happen till the morning!'

The most intriguing occurrence is that of the gerundial future, as a free variant of the other three paradigms. The question to research in (2.1) and (2.2) is whether this form had the same role in Old Romanian as it has in contemporary Spanish or Italian, i.e. that of optional mark of aspect.

2.1. The gerundial future and aspect

The OR gerundial future offered the speaker the possibility to mark aspectual features such as progressiveness or iteration, being a free variant of the infinitival future (we take this paradigm to be representative; of course, the gerundial future also replaced the subjunctive and the *have* future). The Romanian gerundial future could have specialized as an optional mark of aspect, like in other Romance languages, but instead it evolved from an expression of tense to one of modality (expressing presumption).

From a typological point of view, Old Romanian groups together with Romance languages such as Italian, Occitan, Old and Middle French, Spanish, Galician, Catalan, Portuguese, which display a similar structure (auxiliary + present participle) (24a,b). These languages employ a variety of auxiliaries in the aspectual periphrasis. For example, Spanish uses *estar* 'to be', but initially 'to stay', *andar* 'to go', *ir* 'to go', *venir* 'to come', *llevar* 'to carry' (Squartini 1998: 26ff). In Old Romanian, as well as in the other Romance languages, this periphrastic aspectual construction lacks *obligatoriness,* which is crucial if one speaks of an inflectional category, in this case, aspect. In all these languages, the grammaticalization process did not reach the end point, as the structure is still optional. We cannot talk of aspect, but of a tendency to encode aspectual values.

(24) a. I *starò parlando*
b. S *estaré hablando*
c. OR *voi fi vorbind*
'I will be talking.'

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

At the origin of each of these Romance periphrases is a construction with a spatial verb (be it stative, as *a fi* 'to be' in Romanian, *stare* 'to stay' in Italian, *estar* in Spanish, or a motion verb, such as the Spanish *andar, ir* or *venir*) which takes a secondary predication in the form of a gerund in Romanian / present participle in the other Romance languages. Typically, a gerund / present participle encodes an action which is simultaneous with the action of the matrix verb. From being located at a point in space and simultaneously doing a certain activity one comes to express the fact that one is placed in an event which is unfolding. A certain location in space implies being in that place also for a certain time. The locative meaning of the matrix verb progressively goes in the background, while its temporal dimension, originally only an implication, becomes prominent. This process is called by Bybee *et al.* (1991) *semantic generalization.* Syntactically, the spatial verb loses its function of head of the verb phrase, becoming an inflectional head, while the gerund/present participle takes over the role of head of the VP. Spatial expressions are often at the origin of progressives (French *je suis* ***en train de*** *lire,* Dutch *ik ben* ***aan*** *het lezen* 'I am reading').

2.2. Aspectual features of the gerundial future in 16th century Romanian

This marked future tense form contains a gerund, so we expect it to have a progressive or iterative interpretation. However, in PO*,* out of the 24 contexts that were identified, seven are not progressive, thirteen are ambiguous, while only four seem to have a quite clear progressive or iterative meaning.

It has been claimed that the gerundial future in PO reproduces a periphrastic form which is to be found in the Hungarian original text, a form with *-and, -end* (Edelstein 1966). The analysis seems to be correct, at least in those cases in which the verb has no progressive meaning, as in contexts (25) and (26), which reproduce two of the Laws that God gives to His people. In context (25), the verbs in the temporal clause ***va fi ducând*** and ***va fi dând*** clearly refer to an event time prior to that of the verb *aleage* in the main clause (after God takes His people to the land of the Canaanites and gives it to them, they will set apart their first born'). Also in context (26) the action encoded by the gerundial future is anterior to the action encoded by the verb *lase* ('let'), therefore the progressive or iterative interpretation of *va fi lovind* is excluded*.* Moreover, the preceding sentence has a similar structure and here the appropriate infinitival future is used (27).

(25) *11. Şi când* ***va fi ducând*** *pre tine Domnul în pământul canaaneilor, cum au giurat ție şi părinților şi-l* ***va fi dând*** *ție, 12. aleage afară Domnului tot aceaia săva ce-i sămîință de bărbat, de va deşchide zgăul mâni-sa şi tot născutul de-a prima în dobitoacele sale sfințeaşte Domnului.* PO: 221
'When the Lord **has brought** you into the land of the Canaanites, as he swore to you and your ancestors, and **has given** it to you, you shall set apart to the Lord all that first opens the womb. All the firstborn of your livestock that are males shall be the Lord's. OT, Book II, 13: 11

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

(26) *Aşejdere de **va fi lovind** robului său robceei dintele să-i cadză, lase pre ei slobodzi pentru dinte.* PO: 249
'If he **knocks** out the tooth of his slave, male or female, he shall let the slave go free for the tooth's sake.' OT, Book II, 21: 27

(27) *Să neştine **va lovi** ochiul robului său a slujniciei său, cum să-i saie, sloboadză în pace acela pentru urbitura ochiului.* PO: 249
'When a man **strikes** the eye of his slave, male or female, and destroys it, he shall let the slave go free for the eye's sake.' OT, Book II, 21: 26

In a number of contexts, the future with gerund could be analysed as having a progressive (28) or iterative meaning (29). In example (28), the two actions (*va fi năvălind pre noi oaste* 'enemies will be attacking us' and *se vor da către vrăjmaşii noştri* 'they will fight on the side of our enemies') are simultaneous, and the first one can be seen as progressive ('during the attack, the Jewish people will take the side of the enemy'). Context (29) refers to Laws that God gives to His people, therefore, the actions occurring here have a habitual, repetitive reading and they are simultaneous ('every autumn you will hold the feast when you gather the harvest from the field').

(28) *Veniţi cu mândrie să-i călcăm pre ei, că doară se vor înmulţi şi se **va fi năvălind** pre noi oaste, **se vor da** către vrăjmaşii noştri şi răzbind pre noi vor ieşi den cest pământ afară.* PO: 180-181
'Come, let us deal shrewdly with them, lest they multiply, and, if war **befall** us, **they join** our enemies and fight against us and escape from the land.' OT, Book II, 1: 10

(29) *Şi iară să ţineţi sărbătoarea hraneei ce-ai sămănat în câmp, praznicul de pârga seceratului şi praznicul strinsuriei împreună, în săvârşitul anului, cînd toată munca ta den câmp lăuntru o **vei fi stringând.*** PO: 256
'You shall keep the feast of harvest, of the first fruits of your labor, of what you sow in the field. You shall keep the feast of ingathering at the end of the year, when you **gather** in from the field the fruit of your labor.' OT, Book II, 23: 16

The progressive reading of the gerundial future seems clearer in a context like (30), which describes the wrath of God against the Egyptians and the fact that He will protect the Jewish people during His attack. The verb in the temporal clause *cînd **voiu fi bătînd** pământul Eghipetului* encodes an action which is unfolding at event time.

(30) *Că în aceaia noapte voiu treace prespre pământul Eghipetului şi voiu tot născutul de-a prima şi între oameni şi între dobitoace şi giudecăţile meale voiu arăta pre toţi domnedzeii Eghipetului, cu Domnedzeu. 13. Fi-va iară sângele voao semnu1 caseei în carele veţi fi şi voiu vedea sângele şi voiu*

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

treace pre voi, nice va fi în voi bătaie pierdzătoare, când ***voiu fi bătând*** *pământul Eghipetului.* PO: 215
'For I will pass through the land of Egypt that night, and I will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and on all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments: I am the Lord. The blood shall be a sign for you, upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and no plague shall fall upon you to destroy you, when **I smite** the land of Egypt.' OT, Book II, 12: 12-13

Four of Deacon Coresi's texts which are part of the corpus contain examples of gerundial future. Four examples occur in the *Tetraevanghel* (CT) and of these, two are taken over by *Tâlcul Evangheliilor* (CC^1), with no form modification. One example is present in each of the other two texts (CC^2 and CPrav.), but both are ambiguous.

All four examples of CT could be considered to have a progressive interpretation (31).

(31) *Da-se-va voao în acela ceas ce veți grăi. Nu voi amu* ***vreți fi grăindu*** *ce duhulu tatâlui vostru grâi-va întru voi.* CT: 19v
'[…] for what you are to say will be given to you in that hour; for it is not you who **speak** [will be speaking], but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you.' NT, Matthew, 10: 19-20

At least one gerundial future occurrence is not due to the Slavonic original, since it is not present there. Example (32) is provided by Rădulescu (1960: 694), together with the corresponding Old Slavonic original fragment, in which the verb is at present tense. The choice for the gerundial future form in the Romanian translation might be a proof that the structure existed in Romanian, and was not always a copy of a Slavonic or Hungarian model.

(32) *E să zisere rău robu acela întru inima lui: „Pesti-va domnulu mieu a veni" şi va începe a-şi bate soții lui, a mânca şi a be cu beții, veni-va domnulu robului acelui în zi ce* ***nu-l va fi aşteptându*** *şi în ceas ce* ***nu-l ştie*** *şi-l va năduşi de nâprasnâ şi cinste lui cu necredincioşii va fi pusă.* CT: 54v
'But if that wicked servant says to himself, "My master is delayed," and begins to beat his fellow servants, and eats and drinks with the drunken, the master of that servant will come on a day when **he does not expect him** and at an hour **he does not know**, and will punish him, and put him with the hypocrites' NT, *Matthew*, 24: 48-51

If we set aside the contexts in which the gerundial future literally translates a Slavonic structure, the choice between using an infinitival or a gerundial future seems to be driven by the need to express aspectual differences. The gerundial future is marked for the features of progressiveness and iteration, while the

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

infinitival future is the non-marked element. The use of the gerundial future is optional, it is employed if the need appears to especially mark these aspectual features, but the infinitival future can be and is used for the whole range of events (be they punctual, durative, iterative, habitual etc.). The gerundial future never arrived at the stage of grammaticalization at which its employment is obligatory, as it is, for example, the English future continuous (*he will be cooking*).

3. FUTURE TENSE AND MODALITY

Modality is defined as a functional category which encodes the speaker's attitudes and opinions. Generally, two main types of modality are distinguished, i.e. deontic, which have to do with 'influencing actions, states or events', including ability, permission / interdiction external and internal obligation, and epistemic, which express a judgement made by the speaker about the truth of a statement (Palmer 1990: 6). The speaker's degree of commitment towards the truth of the statement is expressed in terms of possibility or probability for a proposition to be true.

Historically, it is argued that deontic modalities develop earlier (since they scope over a VP), while epistemic modalities develop later, from deontic ones, (since they take the whole sentence into their scope) (Traugott, 1989, Bybee *et al.* 1991, Auwera, Plungian 1998). On the other hand, languages seem to have a general tendency to derive more subjective meanings from less subjective ones; the process is called subjectification (Traugott 1989). This converges with the evolution of epistemic meanings from the deontic, since epistemic uses seem to be more subjective than deontic ones, expressing inferences made by the speaker, that sometimes cannot be verified (Palmer 1990: 7).

3.1. Grammaticalization path: deontic modality – future tense – epistemic modality

Studies regarding the grammaticalization of tense and modality (Bybee *et al.* 1991, Bybee *et al.* 1994) have shown that deontic modality marks can develop into future tense inflections. This is the case of the Romance languages, that continue the late Latin periphrasis *cantare habeo*; the periphrasis originally expressed obligation ('I have to sing'), but now encodes the future tense (French: *je chanterai,* Italian: *cantero,* Spanish: *cantare*). It also appears that many languages employ their future tense expression as an epistemic mark. This use is attested in languages such as English, Dutch, Spanish, Italian, and Greek. The epistemic modal function of the future morpheme is a later development than its employment as future tense mark. These findings led to the formulation of a general diagram which shows the direction of semantic development of future tense inflections. The diagram below is adapted from Bybee (1988: 374, see also Bybee *et al.* 1991: 29), to show the evolution of the future auxiliaries *a avea* and *a vrea* in Romanian. It is a more

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

complete version of the diagram under (1-2) above, as it contains the development towards the epistemic use of *a vrea* (with the meaning of supposition).

(33) desire \ / supposition
intention – prediction
possession – obligation / \ –

The semantic shift from prediction to epistemic modality is not difficult to explain, since making a supposition implies making a prediction. The part of meaning which is lost is the future tense reference, since the supposition is made about the present (Bybee 1988).

3.2. From deontic modality to future tense in the 16th century: *The* have *future*

In 16th century Romanian, the *have* future form displays a deontic modal use, which is the source of the future tense use (Auwera, Plungian 1998). Some examples are ambiguous, as the verbal form can be interpreted either as a future or as an expression of deontic modality (34).

(34) *Arâ de bine ce veți face dumile voastre, noi* ***avem a mulțemi*** *ca fraților, şi ce va hi trəba dumilor voastre la noi, noi* ***avem a face*** *preîntru voe dumilor voastre. Lettres B* 5, Suceava (Bucovina), 1593-1597
'And for the good that you will do, **we shall / must thank** you as brothers, and whenever you may need us, **we shall do** as you wish.'

In a context such as (35), the auxiliary *a avea* is used with subjunctive form, in an imperative sentence. The meaning of the verbal phrase *să n'aibă a băntui* is clearly modal (deontic), expressing an interdiction ('mustn't'). Since the auxiliary is not a future tense inflection of the indicative mood, it has forms for other moods, including the subjunctive, as in example (35).

(35) *Şi voi skelarilor, nime* ***să n'aibă a băntui*** *preste dzisa noastră*. *Lettres B* 7, Suceava (Bucovina), 1600
'And you, at the customs, **must not defy** our order'

3.3. From future tense to epistemic modality in the 16th century

The infinitival future

The simple future had already developed a modal use in the 16th century. Its function as an epistemic modality mark is attested in both original (36) and translated texts (37). The type of modality mark in example (36) occurs frequently in 16th and 17th century official documents, being part of the standard expressions of juridical texts. It has seven occurrences in DÎ (none in *Lettres B*). The fact that

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

the fragment does not make reference to a future state of being, but to the present comes out from the underlined passage (it is stated that the serfs already exist on the property at the moment of the transaction, as they were acquired earlier). Context (37) also makes reference to an event simultaneous to the event time, which is past. There are few occurrences of simple infinitival future forms with modal interpretation in translated texts, all given bellow.

(36) *Eu, jupanița Samira, ig(s)p(d)ža Velica, featele lu Ivan vornicul i Ştefan, feciorului lu Pătru, nepotul lu Ivan vornicul, scris-am aceasta a noast[ră] carte sventei dumnezeieşti mănăstire ce se cheamă Golgota, unde iaste hramul svetoe prĕobrĕže[nie], ca să fie sventei mănăstire partea păr[i]ntelui nostru, lu Ivan vornicul, den satu den Răzvad, t[oa]tă şi cu rumânii **câți vor fi**, toată ocina, de câmpu şi den pădure şi den deal cu vii şi den cap până-n cap, de pretu<ti>ndinea, păntru că acea parte de ocină şi cu rumânii au fostu cumpărătoare pre aspri gata d[e] părintele nostru, Ivan vornicul, încă mai dennainte vreame.* DÎ, XXXIX, Zapis de danie, Bălgrad, 1600
'I, lady Samira, *ig(s)p(d) ža Velica,* daughters of nobleman Ivan, and Ştefan, son of Pătru, grandson of nobleman Ivan, wrote this document for the holy monastery Golgota, dedicated to the Transfiguration, to donate all the land of our father, nobleman Ivan in the village of Răzvad, and all the serfs that **may be** there, all the land in the field, in the woods, and in the hills with the vineyards, from one end to the other, all over, because that piece of land and the serfs were bought with cash by our father Ivan the nobleman, some time ago.'

(37) *dzise Domnul cătră Gain : unde iaste fratele tău Avel? El răspunse : nu ştiu, au **voiu fi** eu **păzditoriu** fratelui mieu?* PO: 22
'Then the Lord said to Cain, "Where is Abel your brother?" He said, "I do not know; **am** I my brother's keeper?"' OT, Book I, 4: 9

The subjunctive future

The subjunctive future is also attested with the function of epistemic modality mark (38, 39). Contexts (38, 39) do not express an event which is posterior, but simultaneous to the ET, and expresses uncertainty. There are few structures with modal interpretation in the selected 16th century corpus.

(38) *Mira-se toți şi nu domiria-se, unul cătră altul grăindu: „Ce, amu, **va** aceasta **se fie**?" E alții, amu, ocărându grăiia cumu că „de mustu împluți sîntu".* CB: 16
'And all were amazed and perplexed, saying to one another, "What **does** this **mean**? [What could this mean?]' NT, *Acts,* 2: 12

(39) *Şi ca se mira întru sine Petr, ce **va să fie** acea vedeare ce văzu, şi adecă bărbații ceia tremişii de Cornilie întrebară şi ştiură casa lu Simon […]* CPr: 45

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

'Now while Peter was inwardly perplexed as to what the vision which he had seen might **mean**, behold, the men that were sent by Cornelius, having made inquiry for Simon's house [...]' NT, *Acts,* 10: 17

Gerundial future

None of the gerundial future contexts that were identified in 16th century Romanian texts displays a modal use. It is possible that the use did not yet exist in the 16th century. On the other hand, one can claim that the corpus, containing a number of only 33 examples, is too small to draw a conclusion about the existence of a modal extension of this future form in 16th century Romanian.

It can also be argued that the type of texts which are predominant in the 16th century, religious in nature, makes the use of epistemic modal marks quite unlikely. Religious texts are meant to express convictions, certainties, prophecies, while the function of epistemic modality expressions is to encode the fact that the speaker is not completely committed to the truth of the uttered sentence. If we leave aside the religious texts, the number of 16th century texts with a secular character (private or official letters) is too low to make any strong claims about the modal use of the gerundial future form. As we see in example (17) above, at the beginning of the 17th century, the epistemic modal use of the gerundial future is attested; we can not exclude the hypothesis that it might have also existed in the 16th century.

Future perfect

The future perfect is also used as an epistemic modal mark, in contexts such as (40) and (41), in which it encodes an event that takes place prior to reference time (ET before RT), and reference time is not future, but past in (40) and present in (41). Both examples are taken out of original texts.

(40) *De alta, dau ştire domnivoastră pintru rîndul unui fecior al mieu ce l-au ucis aicea în Tălmaci. Mă rog domniia-voastră să căutaţ cum* ***va fi cu dereptul****: de* ***va fi făcut*** *vro răotate încă să fie încă să fie perit cu judecată, iar, de nu* ***au avut*** *nece o vină, iar mă rog domniia-voastră să căutaţ cum* ***va fi cu dereptul****, că eu* ***voi să caut****, nu* ***voi să las*** *aşa.* DÎ, XXV, Transilvania [1599−1600]
'And now I shall let you know about one of my sons that was killed here in Tălmaci. I ask your Highness to seek what **will be right**: if he **might have done** something wrong, there should still be a trial, and if **he did not do** anything wrong, I ask you to seek what **will be right**, because **I want to/ shall look into it**, **I do not want to/shall not leave** things like this.'

(41) *Ce tocmiţi pre această poruncă şi pohtă ce pohtim noi, să* ***nu veţi fi tocmit*** *voi altă tocmeală mai bună, şi nevoiţi de pripiş cum mai curând, că iaste vreamea aproape acum, cum vedeţi şi domneavoastră şi cum ştiţi, şi rîndul cum iaste încoace;* DÎ, XXXI, Transilvania, 1600

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

'But make this agreement according to our will and orders, if you **might have not** already **reached** a better agreement, and try to hurry, because there is little time left, as you can see and as you know, and as things are here.'

4. CONCLUSIONS

In 16th century Romanian, the infinitival future displays the highest degree of grammaticalization, a state of affairs which also holds in contemporary Romanian. It is also the most frequent future tense form, by far the most used of the four co-occurring paradigms.

Different stages of grammaticalization of the four future forms coexist in the 16th century. In the case of the infinitival and subjunctive future, an identical structure (*a vrea* + short infinitive/subjunctive) is employed in contexts in which *a vrea* has a lexical and functional meaning, which causes ambiguities. In contemporary Romanian, the ambiguity is solved by using different forms of the verb *a vrea* (*voi*/*vreau* 'I shall/I want') and the long infinitive, instead of the short. In the case of the gerundial future, we noticed that it co-occurs with structures that are not yet periphrastic, in which the verb *a vrea* in future tense form takes a gerundial adjunct. As far as the *have* future is concerned, its future tense use coexists with its older deontic use.

Three of the four future forms using the auxiliary *a vrea* (the infinitival and subjunctive future, as well as the future perfect) had already developed an epistemic modal use. There are few contexts with future forms used as epistemic modality marks, but I consider that this is rather due to the type and amount of texts written in the 16th century, than to the fact that this use was just emerging.

Special attention was paid to the competition between the future tense forms in the 16th century, mainly to investigate whether the gerundial future was used as an aspectual variant of the infinitival future. It seems plausible that the gerundial future had the features [progressive] and [iterative] in those contexts in which it is not a mere literal translation of the Slavonic or Hungarian original.

CORPUS

CV *Codicele Voroneţean,* [1563-1583], ediție critică, studiu filologic și studiu lingvistic de Mariana Costinescu, 1981, București, Editura Minerva.

PS *Psaltirea Scheiană: comparată cu celelalte Psaltiri din sec. XVI şi XVII.* Ediție critică de Ion-Aurel Candrea, București: Comisia istorică a României, 1916.

PH *Psaltirea Hurmuzachi,* Ediție Ion Gheție, Mirela Teodorescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

CB *Codice miscelaneu*, copiat de popa Bratul, 1559−1650, ediție de text de Alexandru Gafton, Iași, Editura Universității "Al. I. Cuza", 2003. http://mail.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/

CC[1] Coresi, *Tâlcul Evangheliilor*, [Braşov], c. 1567−1568 şi *Molitvenicul rumânesc*, [Braşov, 1567−1568], ediție critică de Vladimir Drimba, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1998.

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)

CC[2] Coresi, popa Iane, popa Mihai, *Evanghelia cu învățătură*, Braşov, 1581.
CPr. Coresi, *Praxiu* (Faptele Apostolilor), [Braşov, c. 1563], ed. Ion Bianu, 1930.
CPrav. Coresi, *Pravilă* [Braşov, c. 1560−1562], in TR.
CT Coresi, *Tetraevanghel*, Braşov, 1561, ed. Florica Dumitrescu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1963.
PO *Palia,* Orăştie, 1582, ediție critică de Viorica Pamfil, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1968.
DÎ Chivu, Gheorghe, Magdalena Georgescu, Magdalena Ioniță, Alexandru Mareş, Alexandra Roman-Moraru, *Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul XVI,* Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1979.
Lettres B Rosetti, Alexandru, 1926, *Lettres roumaines de la fin du XVIe et du début du XVIIe siècle tirées des archives de Bistritza (Transylvanie),* Bucureşti, Socec.
DRH *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, A. Moldova (vol. XIX, XXIII), B. Țara Românească (vol. XXI, XXIII, XXIV, XXX), Bucureşti, 1965−1974.
Hasdeu, CB B. P. Hasdeu, *Cuvente den bătrâni.* I *Limba română vorbită între 1550-1600,* II *Cărțile poporane ale românilor în secolul XVI în legătură cu literatura poporană cea nescrisă,* Bucureşti, 1878−1879, ed. G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1983−1984.
CTd. *Codicele Todorescu şi Codicele Marțian,* Ediție Nicolae Drăganu, Bucureşti, Socec, 1914.
CP[2] Coresi, [Braşov, c. 1583], ediție Stela Toma, 1976, *Psaltire slavo-română,* în comparatie cu psaltirile coresiene *Psaltirea românească* din 1570 şi *Psaltirea slavo-română* a lui Şerban Coresi din 1589, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei.
TR Gheție, Ion (coord.), 1982, *Texte româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea,* Bucureşti, Editura Academiei.
The Holy Bible (Revised Standard Version) http://quod.lib.umich.edu/r/rsv/: OT The Old Testament; NT The New Testament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auwera, J. van der, V. Plungian, 1998, "On modality's semantic map", *Linguistic Typology*, 2, 79−124.
Berea-Găgeanu, E., 1972, "Structura şi evoluția viitorului în limba română", *Limba română*, XXXI, 2, 1−10.
Bybee, J., 1988, "The diachronic dimension in explanation", in: J. Hawkins (ed.), *Explaining Language Universals*, Oxford, Blackwell, 350−379.
Bybee, J., W. Pagliuca, R. Perkins, 1991, "Back to the future", in: E. Closs Traugott, E. König (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 17−58.
Bybee, J., Ö. Dahl, 1989, "The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world", *Studies in language*, 13, 51−103.
Bybee, J., R. Perkins, W. Pagliuca, 1994, *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
Dimitrescu, F. (coord.), 1978, *Istoria limbii române: fonetică, morfosintaxă, lexic,* Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică.
Edelstein, F., 1966, "Perifraze verbale formate din a fi şi gerunziul verbului de conjugat în limba română", *Cercetări de lingvistică*, 2, 253−262.
Palmer, F. R., 1990, *Modality and the English modals*, London, Longman.
Rădulescu, M., 1960, *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice*, XI, 1960, 3, 691−698.
Sandfeld, Kr., 1930, *Linguistique balkanique*, Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, second edition 1968.
Squartini, M., 1998, *Verbal Periphrases in Romance. Aspect, Actionality, and Grammaticalization,* Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
Traugott, E. C., 1989, "On the rise of epistemic meaning: An example of subjectification in semantic change", *Language*, 65, 31−55.

BDD-A364 © 2011 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:40 UTC)