Constantin-Ioan Mladin

Real or Apparent Morphologic Tendencies? Observations and Clarifying Hypotheses Regarding the Concurrence Between the Indicative and the Subjunctive in the Contemporary Romanian Language

The aim of this paper is to discuss a very recent trend in morphology as regards colloquial and popular contemporary Romanian: the development of a (third person singular and plural) subjunctive-indicative homonymy. The author identifies two different aspects of this phenomenon and suggests several hypotheses concerning their origin.

Key words: *morphologic analogy, verb, homonymy, indicative, subjunctive, category of the person*

1. In a recent article, Rodica Zafiu (ZAFIU) identifies a surprizing particularity of Romanian „oral-written" texts which is the use of present indicative, third person, in combination with the conjunction of the subjunctive (*să* „to"). The linguist admits that it is posssible for the phenomenon to be explained through analogy, that is by the expansion of the homonymy expressed in the first and second persons in indicative and subjunctive (*că* ***vin****/să* ***vin***, *că* ***vii****/să* ***vii***) and in the third person (*că* ***vine****/*să* ***vine***), this transition being sustained also by the existence of a unique form of indicative – subjunctive in a few verbs, for phonetic reasons (*că* ***apropie****/să* ***apropie***).

This particularity does not concern native speakers and targets only foreign Romain speakers and it can also be found in imitations of said foreign speakers.

The structure, be it already a cliché, in which the phenomenon is most obvious is (el/ea, ei/ele) *nu ştie să vorbeşte* (*româneşte*). We discard the construction in the first person (*eu este mândru* [sic !] *că ştie* ***să vorbeşte*** *româneşte şi că este* [sic !] *din România* [5]) and the second person (*Tu nu prea* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *româneşte !* [32]) since we consider these too be an intentional and rather unfortunate expansion of the phenomenon in question. The frequent occurrence of the construction recently is interpreted as a „distinctive signal" of the sociolect of foreign Romanian speakers, the „aberrant" subjunctive being a means of ironising the way gipsies speak. It is not out of the question that the phenomenon „represents an actual tendency – not neccessarily of the way gipsies speak, but of that of the uncultivated popular Romanian language (of the urban areas)".

2. This article intends to examine in depth the phenomenon in question, to show its possible nuances and to propose some plausible hypotheses regarding its cause/origin.

2. 1. With some exceptions (*o* ***să găseşte*** *o „bălărie"* [22; 21]; *Cât de multe urechi necesare îi sunt ca să audă al drumurilor vânt ?/Câți mai au de murit ca* ***să află*** *în sfârşit că oameni prea mulți au murit* [25]; *Jackson se îndrăgosteşte de o femeie de pe altă planetă a cărei populații a suferit de o amnezie în masă, înainte* ***să află*** *ce* [sic !] *aceasta este*

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)

distrugătoarea de lumi [34]; *să îşi asume un rol de „interfaţă" şi* ***să adună*** *protestele celorlalte ONG şi/sau ale persoanelor nemulţumite, să dea cu ele în cap la minister* [sic !] [20]; *vreau o mamă care* ***să vine*** *să mă ajute* [8]; *Pe mulţi îi aud:* ***Să vine*** *altu'* [10]; *dacă ar zice toată lumea ca tine ? „****să vine*** *alţii mai întâi" !* [14]), the subjunctive – conjunctive homonymy appears predominanatly in the succession of two verbs, the most frequent regent verbs being (we ignore the possibility of interpreting some biverbal structures as composed-predicates because this syntactic aspect is irrelevant in the respect to the issues discussed):

(1) *a şti* „to know" (*Nici nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *româneşte !* [24]; *eu sunt de-aia care* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *româneşte [...], deşi se pare că româna e pe cale de dispariţie* [12]; *cine e tipul de la design-kulture care nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *?* [35]; *e* [sic !] *atâţia care nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *româneşte* [26]; *ăştia nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** [10; 28]; *după ce că nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *româneşte, şi-a mai stricat şi cunoştintele despre lb.* [4]; *ştie* ***să vorbeşte*** *româneşte* [14]; *nici unul* ***nu ştie să vorbeşte*** [10]; *moldovenii nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *româneşte* [3]; *femeile face regula* [sic !]. *Femeia o abureşte în special când nici nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *bine româneşte* [33]; *băieţii care nu prea* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** [29]; *ce dacă nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte*** *româneşte* [16]),

(2) *a putea* „can" (*mai termină cu mişţourile p'aici că aşa* ***poate să vorbeşte*** *oricine româneşte* [3]; *Şi lu' care* [sic !] *nu* ***poate să vorbeşte*** *prea bine pe forum şi* ***nu poate să înţelege*** *tot ce se zice aici şi propoziţia pe care o citeşte i se pare că e scrisă* [2]; ***nu pot să află*** *numele noastre ?* [14]; *de veniţi* [sic !] ***poate să vine*** *oricine* [36]; *Dacă* ***poate să vine*** *o echipă ca ASM sau Porto FC până în finală, de ce nu* ***poate*** *o echipa super talentate* [sic !] *ca Ajax* ***să vine*** *pân' acolo* [28]; *poate sâmbătă vrei să vi* [sic !] *cu mine şi Mihai (dacă* ***poate să vine****, a zis că nu promite) sâmbătă* [30]; *vei putea locui acolo sau să* [sic !] ***poate să vine*** *cine vrea acolo* [23]; *Dar ce mai am văzut* [sic !] *la televizor e că Koeman a stat cu Chivu la telefon la care Christi ii* [sic !]*-a zis că-i este greu în Italia, că este o lume dură, unde cu greu se poate obişnui... Ştie că la Ajax numai* [sic !] ***poate să se întoarce*** *din motive financiare, dar îi este dor de Amsterdam şi mai ales echipa Ajax... Eh, cred va-ţi dat seama de ce o iubesc aşa de mult pe* [sic !] *această echipă şi acest oraşi* [sic !] *ca şi Chivu... Este clar, aici ai un popor relaxad* [sic !]. *Daca faci o greşeală fanii te ajut* [sic !] *să te refaci, presa nu te face negru şi echipele sunt ca o familie... De aceea încă îmi pare rău de tot că a plecat de la Ajax, cu el şi cu... (ambii vreau să se întorc* [sic !]*...)* [28]; ***poa' să vine*** *şi fetele ?* [27]) and

(3) *a trebui* „to have to" (*E clar că şi hacheru' şi killăru' scapă mai ieftin, că* ***trebuie să mănânca*** *şi gura lu' procuroru' şi judecătoru'* [sic !] *ceva, nu ?* [14]; *Şi gura lor* ***trebuie să mănânca*** [14]; *o să mai ţin şi dieta ta în zilele în care* ***trebuie să mănânca*** [6]; ***trebuie să mănânca*** *şi stomacul lor, nu ?* [9]; ***Trebuie să vine*** *în Bistriţa să demonstreze capabilitatea cu modele lui* [15]; *Pentru tine a trimis un tricou cu BSA pe spate prin poştă [...] aşteptă liniştit,* ***trebuie să vine*** *cam pe la paştele cailor* [4]; *Adică* ***trebuia să vine*** *pe 20 aug.* [8]; *când merg la asigurări* ***trebe*** [sic !] ***să vine*** *propretaru* [sic !] *că pe el îi asigurarea* [13]).

Theoretically though, any other verb can be in the same situation (*Ce-ai bre cu oamenii,* ***lasă****-i şi pe ei* ***să trăieşte****, ce dacă nu* ***ştie să vorbeşte româneşte*** [16]; *Nu* ***va fi bine să află*** *toată ţara că deja la prima ora bei* [17]; *Pagină dedicată celor ce* ***doresc să află*** *mai multe din Cuvântul lui Dumnezeu* [1]; *o să las oricum posturile pentru alţii care* ***vor să vine*** *pe aici* [31]; *mai* ***rămâne să vine*** *Dănciulescu* [11]; *Lăsaseră idioţii la mişto vreo 5-6 sticle de bere în rând pe mijlocul şoselei şi probabil stăteau în pădure şi* ***aşteptau să vine*** *fraierul să le ia* [7]; ***Ar fi bine să vine*** *odată şi odată* [19]; ***aş prefera să vine*** *la Naţională* [28]; *care* ***vrea să***

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)

vine *cu mine să am şi eu tovarăşi de tren, dau o bere* [18]; ***M-am gândit să vine*** *ofertele şi după aceea văd* [14]; *foarte mulţi* ***speram*** *că nu o* ***să vine*** [36]). The possibility of selecting other regent verbs is also signalled by Rodica Zafiu (***aţi uitat*** *să vorbeşte româneşte*, ***învaţă*** *şi* tu să *vorbeşte româneşte*).

2. 2. If we try to organize the corpus composed of the phrases gathered from the Internet (the original orthography and punctuation have been replaced with the officially-standardized ones, but, most morphologic derailments and some orthographic mistakes – the most outrageous – were kept and signalled using [sic !]), we can establish the following typology:

(1) phrases which recreate the flawed speech of foreign Romanian speakers or that of Romanins whose mother tongue was degraded as an effect of a lengthy stay in a foreign linguistic environment (*Pagină dedicată celor ce* ***doresc să afla*** *mai multe din Cuvântul lui Dumnezeu* [1]).

(2) phrases which mock the quality of the language belonging to this category of speakers, the confusion between the indicative and the subjunctive acting as a conventional identity mark.

(3) phrases which recreate the flawed speech of gipsies.

(4) phrases which are not included in the above mentioned types.

2. 3. In order to discuss the above mentioned phenomenon it is necessary to remember the following facts:

(1) As is well known, the modal system of most languages knows, in different degrees, certain ambiguities and synonymities (DSL: 127), the synonymy between the conjunctive, the infinitive and the supine being specific of the Romanian language (*Mă pregăteam să plec/a pleca/de plecat*). One of the morphologic characteristics of the Romanian language consisting of the semantic substitution, in specific contexts, of the infinitive with the subjunctive represents a particularity of Balkanic origin.

Observation$_1$. An exception is, in the literary Romanian language, the construction of the verb *a putea*, which admits the infinitive as well. The phenomenon has, in the current literary Romanian language, a tendency to return to a previous sitution, under the influence of the neologic models of contruction with the infinitive (*apt a...*), in the present state of the language this concurrence being solved, usually, in the advantage of the infinitive (AVRAM: 207; for details, see p. 209).

The procedure – an inovation from the neo-Greek – is known also by the Bulgarian language, by the Macedonian one as well as by the Albanian language (ROSETTI: 316).

(2) As as in most Romanic languages, in Romanian also the present form of the subjunctive tends to be confused with the present form of the indicative, which have been differentiated even since the common Romanian language, in all verb classes, by the inflexion of the third person both plural and singular. In the present state of the Romanian language, where the present subjunctive is concerned, the verb form is homonymous with the present indicative form in the first person both singular and plural, the second person both singular and plural, while in the third person both singular and plural, homymous between them, the verbs in the indicative ending in *–e* in the third person singular form the subjunctive in *–ă* (*vorbeşte – să vorbească*), and those ending in *–ă* in the indicative form the subjunctive in *–e* (*cântă – să cânte*). There are even some verbs (fewer) which retain (for phonetic reasons) the same form in the subjunctive, in the third person: those present third person singular forms ending in *–ie* (*ştie – să ştie*), verbs like *a ploua*, *a oua*, irregular verbs (*a lua*). The evolution stopped at this stage in Dacoromanian, but was taken to the end (that is

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)

affecting also the third person) in Meglenoromanian and Istroromanian (CARAGIU-MARIOȚEANU: 268-269; ELR: 127).

The redundant construction of the subjunctive – both synthetic (with the aid of inflexions) and analytical (with the aid of the discontinuous morpheme – the conjunction *să*, specialized as a flexional mark) has facilitated the confusion between the two paradigms.

2. 4. The most handy solutions that foreign Romanian speakers have to solve this problem are: **(1)** the use of the second verb in the infinitive – following the structures of their mother tongue, or **(2)** the use of the present indicative, a verbal form which is quickest and surest to learn in a foreign language.

The imitation of the unsure speech of these foreign speakers by the natives, with ironic or comical overtones can only make use of the substition of the subjunctive with the indicative, the Romanian language accepting the infinitve in the subjunctive's stead (with more or less pertinent diastratical, diatopical and diaphasical variations).

2. 5. In the gipsyish language however, the latter possibility is not accepted, because this language (regardless of its sub-dialect) is aware only of the infinitive (SARĂU 1992: 11, SARĂU 2002: 84). In the absence of the infinitive, either the third person singular of the present indicative, the as in other languages – for example in Bulgarian (*cf.* SARĂU 1992), either the second person singular of the subjunctive present preceded by *te* particle (it would be correct to say: the indicative form preceded by *te* – a mark of the subjunctive!) are indicated as the standard (CHERATA 2001: 96, 97-98). The last solution allows the clasification of the verbs in five flexional classes, following the model of the languages which have an infinitive form.

Thus, in the verb + verb sequence, the second term must express subjunctive necessity.

But in the „vlahic" dialect (see **Observation$_2$**), spoken by the vast majority of the gipsies, including the „caldarari" (see **Observation$_3$**), regarding the verbs (very many and belonging to the basic lexus) ending in *–áw* the paradigm of the present indicative, in all three persons, is identical with that of the subjunctive (CHERATA 1994: 121, 122, 123, 131; CHERATA 2001: 114; SARĂU 2002: 62-63, 66), the differentiation being made exclusively with the aid of the conjunction *te* „to". Moreover, the presence of the conjunction can have an optional character (CHERATA 2001: 114). We illustrate this idea below, in the form of a table – **Table$_1$**, the conjugation (see **Observația$_4$**) of two of the most important verbs belonging to this category – *keráw* „to do" and *phenáv* „to talk, to speak".

Observation$_2$. We still use the syntagm *dialect vlah* even though today this terminology is out of date (see the observtions regarding this aspect in SARĂU 2002: 9), since the first term of the construction, compared to *grai*, is capable of derivation (thus from purely because of reasons related to style) and the second term is in accordance with the informal level of our demonstration. Disegarding the fact that recent research has disabled this concept (*dialect vlah*/*dialect non-vlah*), we make the specification that the terminologic syntagm itself *dialect vlah + de varietate românească + al limbii (r)romani* holds two logical contradictions (pointed out by Lucian Cherata).

Observation$_3$. The idiom was adopted as a model-unit in Prague in 2002 (CHERATA 2001: 7-8).

Observation$_4$. The characters marked with bold indicate the inflexions. We have adopted the graphic writing suggested by Gh. Sarău (SARĂU 1992, SARĂU 2002).

It would have been ideal to be have been able to follow the modal configuration of all the gipsyish dialectal variations spoken all over Romania, but, for now, our information in this

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)

regard is partial. The fact that in other gipsyish idioms the opposition between the indicative and the subjunctive is though clearly marked, does not change the situation a great deal, because these idioms are in minority when related to the one included in the „vlahic" variety – *cf.* the paradigm of the verb *keráw* „to do" in the indicative and in the subjunctive in the speech of the „spoitori" (see **Observation$_5$**) – **Table$_2$** (SARĂU 2002: 91-92, 95).

Observation$_5$. The speech, widely used especially in the urban communities located along the Danube, is spoken by groups which came from Turkey and still keep many Turkish linguistic particularities.

As a result, the construction from the speech of the bilingual gipsies such as (el/ea, ei/ele) *nu ştie să vorbeşte* represents a structural translation loan (morphological, but syntacatically conditioned) according to the patter of the gipsyish language.

Thus, the future indicative, in the „vlahic" dialect (including the speech of „caldarari"), is formed by adding the *–a* inflexion to the forms of the present indicative: (me) *keráw*; *phenáv* > (me) *keráw**a***; *phenáv**a***, in the first person, (tu) *kerés*; *phenés* > (tu) *kerés**a***; *phenés**a***, in the second person singular and so and so forth; the conditional is obtained by adding the *–as* inflexion to the indicative present forms, the inflexions being identical to those of the imperfect indicative: (me) *keráw*; *phenáv* > *te keráw**as***; *phenáv**as***, in the first person singular, (tu) *kerés*; *phenés* > (tu) *te kerés**as***; *phenés**as***, in the second person singular and so on and so forth (CHERATA 1994: 129-130, 132; CHERATA 2001: 111-112; 115; SARĂU 1992: 66, 66-67).

At the same time, the frequent use of this morphological „derailment" by the native Romanian speakers as a means to individualise the altered speech of the gipsies finds its explanation in the loss of the evocative capacity which, until not long ago, the lexical elements specific of the sociolect of this community had. The phenomenon took place in the last decade following the strong „democratisation" and oralisation of the discourse at the most different levels, leading to even the loosening off the differences between them and being strongly sustained by the mass-media. The lexems attributed traditionally and conventionally to the gipsyish vocabulary (*cf.* : *barosan*, *băşcăli*/*băşcălie*, *benga*, *bişţari*, *bonghi*/*bonghit*, *bulan*, *canci*, *carici*, *dili*/*diliu*, *gagică*, *gagiu*/*gagică*, *acana*/*hacana*, *haleală*, *hali*, *lovele*, *mandea*, *manghli*/*manghlitor*, *mişto*, *muie*, *nasol*, *paradi*/*paradit*, *pirandă*, *prădui*/*prăduitor*, *şucar*, *şucăreală*, *şucări* and others), after a lengthy stage in the argotic register of the Romanian language, have lost much (sometimes all) of their capacity to suggest the language of origin or the sociolect which borrowed them. In this context, the use of a moprhological particularity instead of the respective lexiccal units (or the association of these) becomes a procedure of linguistic marking which is extremely efficient in suggesting the identity of a sociolect. The massive invastion of the construction in the Romanian language happened thanks to the strong mediatization of the the speech of the locals belonging to this ethnic group (see **Observation$_6$**) and thanks to its frequent imitation, both in written and spoken press.

Observation$_6$. Their number does not know, in reality, significant changes (1.8% of the total population, which represents the second ethnic minority of Romania, according to the information offered by the 1992 public statistic – *apud* BURTEA *et alii*: 59). The differences in quantity which have generated many polemics in later years, are due mainly to the difference between the measure in which the subjects in question identify themselves as gipsies and the way they are identified by others in their community. We do not, however, at present, have statistics regarding the number of speakers of gipsyish dialects (meaning those

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)

who were not assimilated by the Romanian community or, fewer in number, those who weren't assimilated by the Hungarian one, etc.). One thing though is certain: their number must be considerably smaller than the one of the (self)proclaimed gipsies.

2. 6. The phrases attributed to some speakers who have nothing in common with the categories in question (meaning the foreign Romanian speakers, the bilingual gipsies and the Romanians which ironise the representatives of the first two categories) and those which don't necessarily refer to the degree of linguisting performance are left out (*Cât de multe urechi necesare îi sunt ca să audă al drumurilor vânt ?/Câți mai au de murit ca* ***să află*** *în sfârşit că oameni prea mulți au murit* [25]; *Jackson se îndrăgosteşte de o femeie de pe altă planetă a* [sic !] *cărei populații a* [sic !] *suferit de o amnezie în masă, înainte* ***să află*** *ce* [sic !] *aceasta este distrugătoarea de lumi* [34]; *să își asume un rol de „interfață" şi* ***să adună*** *protestele celorlalte ONG si/sau ale persoanelor nemulțumite, să dea cu ele în cap la minister* [sic !] [20]; *vreau o mamă care* ***să vine*** *să mă ajute* [8]; ***nu pot să află*** *numele noastre ?* [14]; *de veniți* [sic !] ***poate să vine*** *oricine* [36]; *Dacă* ***poate să vine*** *o echipă ca ASM sau Porto FC până în finală, de ce nu* ***poate*** *o echipa super talentate* [sic !] *ca Ajax* ***să vine*** *pân' acolo* [28]; *poate sâmbătă vrei să vi* [sic !] *cu mine şi Mihai (dacă* ***poate să vine****, a zis că nu promite) sâmbătă* [30]; *vei putea locui acolo sau să* ***poate să vine*** *cine vrea acolo* [23]; *Dar ce mai am văzut* [sic !] *la televizor e că Koeman a stat cu Chivu la telefon la care Christi ii* [sic !]*-a zis că-i este greu în Italia, că este o lume dură, unde cu greu se poate obişnui... Ştie că la Ajax numai* ***poate să se întoarce*** *din motive financiare, dar îi este dor de Amsterdam şi mai ales echipa Ajax... Eh, cred va-ți dat seama de ce o iubesc aşa de mult pe* [sic !] *această echipă şi acest oraşi* [sic !] *ca şi Chivu... Este clar, aici ai un popor relaxad* [sic !]*. Dacă faci o greşeală fanii te ajut* [sic !] *să te refaci, presa nu te face negru şi echipele sunt ca o familie... De aceea încă îmi pare rău de tot că a plecat de la Ajax, cu el şi cu... (ambii vreau să se intorc* [sic !]*)* [28]; ***Trebuie să vine*** *în* [sic !] *Bistrița să demonstreze capabilitatea cu modele lui* [15]; *Nu* ***va fi bine să află*** *toată țara că deja la prima ora bei* [17]; ***Ar fi bine să vine*** *odată şi odată* [19]; ***aş prefera să vine*** *la Națională* [28]; ***M-am gândit să vine*** *ofertele şi după aceea văd* [14]; *foarte mulți* ***speram*** *că nu o* ***să vine*** [36]). Even eliminating the phrases in which it is obvious that the indicative follows after the conjunction *să* with ludic, self-ironical intentions (referring directly to the way that foreign speakers or gipsies speak) or which gathers other exceptions from the standard (especially ortographic and morphologic ones), their number is still surprisingly high.

The explanation which seems most acceptable, at present, is the one claiming that, in certain educationally disfavoured and culturally marginalised social layers, the tendency to eliminate the formal opposition between the indicative and the subjunctive, by taking up and following through with an older evolutive procedure is manifested. This has very general internal causes, namely the wish to make as small an effort as possible while communicating (under the aspect of transmitting information, one single mark – *să* – proves sufficient). External causes cannot be taken into account, such as the imitation of the model (intentionally or unconsciously) which might be represented by the specific speech of foreign inhabitants of an area, since the above mentioned speech is always present in unfavourable contexts, deprived of social and cultural prestige.

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)

Table$_1$

PERS.	PRESENT INDICATIVE	PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE
	SINGULAR	**SINGULAR**
I	(me) *ker**áw***; *phen**áw***	(me) (*te*) *ker**áw***; *phen**áw***
II	(tu) *ker**és***; *phen**és***	(tu) (*te*) *ker**és***; *phen**és***
III	(wow, woj) *ker**él***; *phen**él***	(wow, woj) (*te*) *ker**él***; *phen**él***
	PLURAL	**PLURAL**
I	(amén) *ker**ás***; *phen**ás***	(amén) (*te*) *ker**ás***; *phen**ás***
II	(tumén) *ker**én***; *phen**én***	(tumén) (*te*) *ker**én***; *phen**én***
III	(won) *ker**én***; *phen**én***	(won) (*te*) *ker**én***; *phen**én***

Table$_2$

PERS.	PRESENT INDICATIVE	PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE
	SINGULAR	**SINGULAR**
I	(me) *ker**á(w)a***	(me) (*te*) *ker**áw***
II	(tu) *kér**ca***	(tu) (*te*) *ker**és***
III	(o dá, oj dęá) *kér**la***	(o dá, oj dęá) (*te*) *ker**él***
	PLURAL	**PLURAL**
I	(amé) *ker**ás**a*	(amé) (*te*) *ker**ás***
II	(tumé) *kér**(é)n**a*	(tumé) (*te*) *ker**én***
III	(oná, odaná) *kér**(é)n**a*	(oná, odaná) (*te*) *ker**én***

1 decembrie 1918 University, Alba-Iulia

INTERNET ADDRESSES:

1 [cicnet.ro], **2** [cioace.netfirms.com], **3** [clopotel.ro], **4** [computergames.ro], **5** [counter-strike.ro], **6** [culinar.ro], **7** [daciaclub.ro], **8** [desprecopii.com], **9** [div.ro], **10** [fanclub.ro], **11** [fcsteaua.ro], **12** [forum.kappa.ro], **13** [forum.run.ro], **14** [forum.softpedia.com], **15** [f50.parsimony.net], **16** [gamesmania.ro], **17** [jackosnow.3x.ro], **18** [jucaushii.ro], **19** [linux360.ro], **20** [lists. ngo.ro], **21** [lug.ro], **22** [mail-archive.com], **23** [moldova.net], **24** [muzicabuna.ro], **25** [muzica.info], **26** [nebunii.ro], **27** [netsport.ro], **28** [onlinesport.ro], **29** [revistapresei.ro], **30** [rhc.ro], **31** [roportal.ro], **32** [sexpert.ro], **33** [singur.ro], **34** [st4rg4t3.com], **35** [timbru.com], **36** [virtualarad.net].

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)

References

Avram, Mioara (1997): *Gramatica pentru toți*, Bucuresti: Humanitas

Burtea, Vasile, Viorel Gheorghe *et alii* (1993): *Țiganii între ignorare şi îngrijorare*. Coordonatori: Elena Zamfir, Cătălin Zamfir. Ed. Alternative

Caragiu-Marioțeanu, Matilda (1969): Verbul in *Istoria limbii române*, vol. II. Coord: Al. Rosetti, B. Cazacu, I. Coteanu. Bucuresti: EARSR, 254-279.

Cherata, Lucian (1994): *Istoria țiganilor. Origine, specific, limbă*. Bucuresti: Ed. Z

Cherata, Lucian (2001): *Gramatica limbii rromani. Alfabet. Transcriere fonetică. Morfologie*. Editura. Sitech. Craiova

DSL - Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela, Cristina Călăraşu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mihaela Mancaş, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (1997): *Dicționar general de ştiințe. Ştiințe ale limbii*, Bucuresti: EŞ.

ELR – Avram, Mioara, Jana Balacciu-Matei *et alii* (2001): *Enciclopedia limbii române*. Coord: Marius Sala. Bucuresti: Editura. Univers Enciclopedic

Rosetti, Al.(1965): Situația limbii române între limbile balcanice in SCL, XVI. nr. 3, 313-326.

Sarău, Gheorghe (1992): Morfologia dialectului vlah de varietate românească al limbii romani. Schiță in *Mic dicționar rom-român*. Bucure□ti: Editura Kriterion

Sarău, Gheorghe (2002): *Limba rromani (Morfologie şi sintaxă)*. Bucuresti: Credis

Zafiu, Rodic (2004): Ştie să vorbeşte...in *România literară* XXXVII. nr. 31, 12.

BDD-A3703 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 17:11:34 UTC)