THE EXPRESSION OF ANTERIORITY IN THE 16TH CENTURY ROMANIAN LANGUAGE: THE INDICATIVE ANALYTIC FORMS[1]

Abstract*: The analysis of the 16th-century texts (translations and original texts) emphasizes the highly analytic character of the verbal system. This analytic character is reflected by numerous compound and hyper compound forms conveying various modal and especially temporal values. Along with the imperfect, preterite and past perfect synthetic forms, which express the anteriority reference even in the current indicative mood, certain simultaneous periphrases, have also been used. Moreover at least two analytic forms can be used together with a synthetic form, proving therefore the tendency towards a simpler and a more expressive linguistic reality. The structure of such periphrases contains an auxiliary* - to be *or* to have - *used with various tenses and verb forms, in the past participle or the gerund.*

Keywords*: verb, previousness, analytic.*

Introduction

The morphological system of the vulgar and late Latin suffered a series of changes determined by various phonetic and semantic factors. These tendencies are clearly noticed within the verbal system of Old Romanian, i.e. in: the reorganization of the voice system, the loss of the aspect value and the development of the temporal sense, changes of value for certain moods and the emergence of new ones, the transfer of some paradigms from a certain tense or mood to a further one, the emergence of new tenses, inflection unification and paradigm regularization, where similarity played an important role- the emergence of numerous analytic forms.

Unlike nowadays Standard Romanian, the verbal system of the 16th century Romanian language had a highly analytic character. This character is reflected by numerous compound and hyper compound forms, expressing various modal and especially temporal values: the subjunctive, the conditional, the future and most of the tenses which expressed anteriority and passive forms.

Together with the indicative preterite forms there have been mentioned analytic forms, simultaneously used with the inherited synthetic ones, composed of the auxiliaries *a fi* or *a avea* in various tenses and the past participle or the gerund of the verb form.

1. Structures with the auxiliary *a avea*

The auxiliary *a avea* and the past *participle* are elements of two compound structures with the following paradigmatic variants:

1.1. the auxiliary *a avea* in the present tense + *the past participle* form of the verb which conveys (even today) the past perfect value for both transitive and intransitive verbs.

1.1.1. the present paradigm of the auxiliary *a avea* used with the past perfect shows, as in nowadays Standard Romanian, various forms in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th person in comparison to the verb lexeme and the 1st and 4th person homonymy. The texts from the 16th century emphasize also a further homonymy, i.e. the 3rd and the 6th person homonymy, under the *au*[2] form, which is exhibited only within context:

---

[1] Ilona Bădescu, University of Craiova, ilonabadescu@yahoo.com.

[2] The *au* form of the auxiliary, in the 3rd person, is preserved even nowadays in some parts of Moldavia "when reporting an action from the distant past or from informal texts" (Lăzărescu,

BDD-A5874 © 2011 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:58:00 UTC)

...într-aceĭa jupăneasa Ancaa ***n-au faptu*** *coconii cu Codré logofăt, ce* ***au luat****-o pré o sooru a Codréei...* (TM, 96); *Giudeţulu e fără milă celora ce* ***n-au faptu*** *milă* (CV, 60 r/6-7); *Şi popa să ţie şi el ce-****au luat*** *sfânta parte...* (CL, 39 r/11-12); *Şi face cuvântŭ Dumnezeu de'ntreabă, şi cuvântŭ face către cei ce* ***au luatŭ*** *...* (CCînv, 318); *... aceasta-i ce Domnul* ***au grăit*** *...* (PO, 233/19-20); *Aceştia-s care* ***au grăit*** *lu Faraon* (PO, 197/22-23); *... să ne închinăm şi să slăvim cum* ***au grăit*** *prorocii* (ÎC, 7 v/15-18 r/2); *Botezul, cum* ***au scris*** *sfântul Matei evanghelist...* (ÎC, 10 v/6-7); *Şi au ales 4 evanghelişti den limba ovreiască pre limba grecească, de-****au scris*** *Evanghelia* (ÎC, 1 r/8-9).

Simultaneously, together with *au*, the form *a* occurs, in the 3rd person, both in the translations within areas and in documents: *a dat* (IC, 7 r/12, 21/3); *s-a dăscumpărat* (DÎR, XXI, 2); *a făcut* (PO, 69/26); *a muritu* (Cod. Marţ., 148 r/6); *n-a uitat* (PO, 144/23-24); *a vrutŭ* (PH în PS, 187/35); *a vrut (fi)* (Cod. Teod., 36 v/5).

Rarely, forms of the auxiliary *a* instead of *au* occur in the 6th [1] person as well: *a fost(u)* (DÎR, XLI, 2); *s-a temut* (Cod. Teod., 113 v/8); *a zis* (DÎR, II*, 10).

1.1.2. As part of the compound preterite, *the past participle* is usually invariable. It can be optionally conjoined with an *-u* without a morphological value, but whose presence is required in reversed forms, if pronominal clitics are inserted between the two elements of the verb phrase (see *infra*). In few cases, in one document, for example, – *Istoria unui proces, Tîrgu-Jiu, 1591, octombrie, 13* (în CB, 111) a compound preterite structure with a feminine *-ă*[2] *past* participle form is mentioned twice: *Să se ştie cum* ***au mersă*** *Moldovénul de în Scoarţa...*; *... Moldovénul au apucat vărtos pre Stănilă ... şi* ***au mersă*** *de faţă amăndoi*..

The compound preterite periphrasis occurs with an enclitic[3] auxiliary, a typical characteristic of this period: *adus-am* (PO, 153/14); *făcut-am* (DÎR, 1-2); *coperit-ai* (CP, 163 v/2); *nădăjduit-ai* (CCînv, 251); *cerşut-au* (DÎR, XXXII, 263 v/3); *înmicşurat-au* (CP, 10 v/5); *adaos-au* (DÎR, XIX, 262 r/16, 262 v/7) etc.

Usually, the forms of the compound preterite can be used discontinuously through the insertion, of some pronouns, adverbs or short noun phrases. However, ample contexts are rarely mentioned:

se au *ţie* ***arătat*** (PO,119/16); ***au*** *pre ei pre toţi* ***blagoslovit*** (PO, 175/27); ***aţi*** *aceasta* ***cerut*** (PO, 210/20); ***se au*** *de voe* ***datŭ*** (CCînv, 88); ***au*** *până acmu* ***făcut*** (PO, 193/4); ***au*** *aşa* ***iubitŭ*** (CCînv, 350); ***au*** *în cinste* ***înşelatŭ*** (CCînv, 453); ***n-au*** *iară* ***întors*** (PO, 10/22-23); **ne-*amŭ*** *cu aceea* ***măritŭ*** (CCînv, 94); ***amŭ*** *cineva* ***obiditŭ*** (CCînv,

---

1984: 225) and very rare in the Southern part of Banat (Neagoe, 1984: 263). Nowadays, at the dialectal level, the auxiliary shows, in the 3rd and 6th person, the following forms: *a-a* in Wallachia (in the proper Wallachian idioms and in the South-Eastern part of Oltenia (Ionică, 1984: 178-179); *o-o* in Moldavia (Lăzărescu, op. cit. : 225); *o-or* in Banat (Neagoe, op. cit. : 263); şi *o-o/or* in Crişana (Urițescu, 1984 : 309) and Maramureş (Vulpe, 1984 : 337).

[1] The *a* form of the auxiliary in the 6th person is mentioned three times in *Codex Sturzanus* as well, though Gh. Chivu (apud Frâncu, 2009 : 112) states that, in this situation, it represents a graphic omission and not a morphological innovation.

[2] Regarding this form Densusianu (1961: 143) maintains that it could be only a graphic symbol. Such past participle forms are rarely encountered nowadays in some parts of Maramureş (Vulpe, *op. cit.*: 367) though they are frequently encountered in Aromanian (Saramandu, 1984: 457; Livescu, 2004: 84).

[3] Nowadays the enclitic auxiliary is frequently encountered in the subdialect of Maramureş (Vulpe, *op. cit.*: 337) and Crişana (Urițescu, *op. cit.*: 309).

BDD-A5874 © 2011 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:58:00 UTC)

446); ***au*** *dentru ei* ***peritŭ*** (CCînv, 187); ***ai*** *tu* ***sfrăşit*** (PS, 16/10); ***au*** *toate* ***tocmitŭ*** (CCînv, 134); *s-***au** *neştire după al şasele ćas* ***ajunsu*** (TM, 84); ***au*** *Domnedzeu toate acestea* ***arătat*** (PO, 143/10-11); ***au*** *Domnul cu noi* ***făcut*** (PO, 221/16-17); ***aţi*** *astădzi aşa curund* ***venit*** (PO, 184/13-14) etc.

In the reversed word order, the two elements can be used discontinuously through the insertion of clitic pronouns (personal or reflexive, atonic form) and in this situation the past participle is emphasized by a final *u*: ***adăpatu****-ne-****ai*** (CP, 109 r/9); ***adăpatu****-l-****ai*** (CP, 116 r/12); ***adusu****-o-****au*** (DÎR, XXXVI, 252 v/1); ***arătatu****-se-****au*** (PO, 170/13); ***cerşutu****-ţe-****au*** (CP, 33 r/15); ***datu****-mi-i-****ai*** (CCînv, 314); ***datu****-mi-i-****aţi*** (CCînv, 360) etc.

1.2. the auxiliary *a avea* in the imperfect + the verb past *participle* (inflected)[1], in an optional word order, denotes the past perfect. This structure occurs rearly, only within two Coresian translations: *Auzi tânărulŭ cuvântŭ, şi se duse oscârbitŭ; era amu de* ***avea agonisitŭ*** *multu* (CT, 31; CCînv, 288); ***Auzită avea*** *ce e den elŭ de facerea ciudeselorŭ …* (CCînv, 441).

2. Structures with the auxiliary *a fi*

The auxiliary *a fi* is part of some compound and hyper compound structures where the second element is a gerund or a past participle. As auxiliary, *a fi* is homonymous with the verb. With its help there were formed: 2 imperfect structures, 3 preterite structures, 3 past perfect structures.

2.1. *a fi* + *gerund* structures

2.1.1. *Compound structures* which exhibit the following paradigmatic variants:

2.1.1.1. the *preterite* of the auxiliary *a fi* + *the gerund* form of the verb in the imperfect [2]. The periphrasis does not occur in documents, but only in translations and it is rare. It occurs in texts of both northern and southern areas (the most frequently encountered instances are in the Coresian texts):

era mărrgându (CV, 19 v/9-10); *era postindu-mă* (CA, 47); *era rugându-mă* (CA, 50); *era stându* (CV, 21 v/11); *era arătând* (CT, 86); *era fiindŭ* (CCînv, 478); *era suspinândŭ* (CCînv, 245); *era făcând* (CT, 85); *era ducându-se* (CT, 137); *era lăcuindŭ* (CCînv, 235).

Sometimes, the analytic forms may occur together with the synthetic forms, within the same clause:

... însumi ***era stându*** şi ***lăsa*** spre uciderea lui şi *străjuiia* ... (CV, 21 v/10-13); *Şi* ***era*** *oamenii* ***aşteptând*** *Zahariea şi* ***se mira*** *că pesti el în beserecă* (CT, 86); ***Era*** *unii de(â)n cărtulari aice* ***şăzând(ŭ)*** *şi* ***cugeta*** *întru inimile lor(ŭ)* (CT, 55); *Şi* ***era suspinândŭ*** *şi* ***tremura*** *pre pământ* (CCînv, 245).

The word order of the most frequently mentioned periphrases is *auxiliary + verb,* however, there exist several examples with an enclitic auxiliary: *zăcându era* (CCînv, 243); *stând era* (CP, 249 r/2).

[1] A similar form of past perfect, but with a non inflected past participle, was mentioned within the dialectal texts in Wallachia and Moldavia (Marin, 1985 : 466-467).

[2] This periphrastic imperfect preserved its value and usage within the northern area while within the southern area it was rarely used in the first decades of the 17th century.

BDD-A5874 © 2011 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:58:00 UTC)

The elements of the periphrasis could be used discontinuously[1] through the insertion, between the auxiliary and the verb phrase, of various noun phrases and even of complex structures[2]:

> *În vremea aceaia* ***era*** *Isusŭ* ***învăţându*** în besearecă … (CCînv, 406); *Luară piatra de unde* ***era*** *mortul(ŭ)* ***zăcând(ŭ)*** (CT, 162; CCînv, 96); *Şi* ***era*** *oamenii* ***aşteptând*** Zahariea (CT, 86); … ***eram*** *noi* ***mergând*** …(CA, 75); ***Era*** *amu atunce Domnulŭ Hristosŭ de ceaia parte de Iordanŭ* ***îmblându*** (CCînv, 97); *Că* ***eraţi*** *ca oile* ***rrătăcindu*** *şi întoarrsetu-vă acmu cătră păstoriul acela socototoriul sufletelor voastre* (CV, 75 v/10-11); *Şi* ***era*** *şi hananei şi ferezei* ***lăcuind*** *acolo pre acel pământ …* (PO, 46/5); ***Era*** *unii de(â)n cărtulari aice* ***şăzând(ŭ)*** *şi cugeta întru inimile lor(ŭ)* (CT, 55); *… iar alţii mulţi* ***era*** *goli şi* ***degerându*** *de gerŭ şi de răceală* ***îngheţându-se*** (CCînv, 364).

2.1.1.2. the preterite form of *a fi* + *the gerund* form of the verb by means of which the preterite was expressed: *fuiu lucrându* (CV, 9 v/12-13); *fu cercetând* (CA, 41), *fu ducându-se* (CT,122); *fu-mi mergându* (CA, 107); *fu purtându-ne* (CA, 134); *fu trecând* (PO, 138/25); *fum veselindu-nă* (PS, 273/9, CP, 252 r/10); *fură curând* (CA, 104).

2.1.1.3. *a fi* in the past perfect + *the gerund* form of the verb, mentioned only once by Coresi, has a past perfect value: *Iară acesta ce scrie Marco, patr' înşi-lŭ* ***fusease purtându*** (CCînv, 58).

2.2. *A hyper compound structure* formed by the past perfect form of *a fi* + *the gerund* form of the verb[3] by means of which the preterite was expressed: *aţi fost îmblând* (CA, 416); *au fost şezându* (DÎR, LX, 3; CB, 88); *au fost zăcându* (CCînv, 370).

However, within certain contexts, this structure seemed to have a past perfect sense:

---

[1] According to E. Dragoş (1995: 83), the existence of both reversed and discontinuous periphrastic forms is due to a nearly tough pressure "of the text from which it was translated, some aspects of this pressure being transposed, as imitations, in the translated text".

[2] Various opinions were stated concerning discontinuous structures formed by using various lexical elements or complex structures of the compound verb phrases. In older thesis, such discontinuous structures were considered "completely unnatural" (Drăganu, 1914: 138) and specialists explained them by a faithful imitation of the translators of Slavonic and Hungarian syntax (Rosetti, 1968: 566). D. Moldovanu (1977-1978: 45-70) denies the imitation of foreign syntactic models. According to the author, such structures, which he calls "perimorphologic forms" are nothing else but "functioning modalities of the Romance *type*", for which the author establishes several evolution phases, the situation of the 16th century exhibiting a "rule" of the old language which admitted, more easily, the insertion of several elements belonging to any lexical class. This opinion was somehow shared by I. Gheţie and Fl. Zgraon (1981: 180-181) as well. The occurrence of such structures only in cultural texts and documents written by "educated persons, accustomed to the writing", made the authors consider that they "do not originate from the 16th century language". Considered "relics of a previous period of the 16th century", when they met "a real spreading in the spoken language", their usage within this period represents "the expression of a syntactic mannerism, which tended to offer a specific structure, opposed to the spoken language, the literary message".

[3] Nowadays this periphrasis is used in the imperfect form in Muntenia, in some idioms from Crişana (Uriţescu, op. cit.: 308) and rarely in Maramureş (Vulpe, *op. cit.* : 336), in Dobrogea and Oltenia (Marin, *op. cit.* : 461).

BDD-A5874 © 2011 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:58:00 UTC)

Că mulți amu oameni au fostŭ făcutŭ bunătăți şi nemica d-insele n-au avutŭ folosŭ, c-au fostŭ făcândŭ totu cu laudă şi trufă (CCînv, 49); Semnează-se, că alu ceriului au fostŭ fiindu Hristosŭ proslăvitŭ, şi de susŭ deştinse (CCînv, 106); Una amu, ca să arate celuia ce se izbăvi, câtă nevoie şi câți draci au fostŭ avândŭ întru elŭ ... (CCînv, 377); şi nu den începutu judecă pre elŭ pentru năravulŭ celŭ nebunescŭ alŭ lui, ce încă aducea lui de pururea şi altă bogăție cătră bogățiia ceaia ce-au fostŭ avândŭ dentâi. (CCînv, 398); Davidŭ amu spune-se iubitu şi blândŭ; ş-au fostŭ aşa fiindŭ. (CCînv, 442).

2.2. *a fi + past participle* structures

2.2.1. *Compound structures* which exhibit the following paradigmatic variants:

2.2.1.1. the imperfect of the auxiliary *a fi + the past participle* of the verb form (inflected or non inflected)[1], by means of which the past perfect was expressed:

era adus (PO, 150/22-23); *era dzis* (CV, 9 r/7); *era grăitŭ* (CCînv, 495); *era înpărțit* (Cod. Teod., 13 v/1-2); *era venit(ŭ)* (CT, 162; CCînv, 95); *eram aflați* (PO, 155/27 – 156/2); *eram morți* (Cod. Teod., 95 v/ 5-6); *erați grăit* (PO, 154/3); *era merşi* (CV, 42 r/13); *era veniți* (CCînv, 95); *era dzis* (PO, 145/4).

This periphrasis is mentioned only in translated texts, both in the Northern and Southern types. In most cases, the auxiliary is clitic to the verb form, though, there is mentioned one form with an enclitic auxiliary: ***Negrăiți era*** *urul cătră alaltu; duseră-se* (CV, 52 r/11-12). This structure can be used discontinuously through the insertion of a pronoun as subject, of an adverb or (rarely mentioned) through a complex structure:

… înțelease că rrimlenu easte, şi ca ***era*** *elu* ***vădzutu****, demîreața vrea să se înțeleagă deadevăru cea ce cleveteaşte-se de iudei* (CV, 23 r/7-11); *Şi deaca trecură 40 de zile deschise fereastra spre corabie, ce* ***era*** *el* ***făcut****, şi slobozi un corb a zbura...* (PO, 32/10-12); *Şi sluga înainte spuse pre rând toate lucrurile ce* ***era*** *el* ***isprăvit***. (PO, 82/2-4); ***…*** *derep ce postul* ***era*** *amu* ***venritu***, *şi se rruga Pavelu, grăiia loru…* (CV, 43 r/6-8); *Însă mai denainte* ***era*** *feciorulŭ lu Airŭ şi feciorulŭ văduoi* ***învisu*** *den moarte*. (CCînv, 97).

2.2.1.2. the past perfect form of *a fi + the past participle* of the verb form, in an optional word order[2], denotes also the past perfect:

Şi salce-l ***fusesĭa vădzut****, şi dzise …; Şi rugul* ***fusesĭa vădzut****, şi dzise …* (TB, 219); *Oprită fu bunătatea de pre pământŭ dentr' acelea zile de ce* ***fusease zisŭ*** (CCînv, 193); *Iară de veri fi auzitŭ de aceasta, mulțumeaşte dereptu căce* ***auzitŭ fuseşi*** (CCînv, 323).

2.2.1.3. the imperfect form of *a fi + the past participle* form of the verb, with an optional word order, denotes a compound preterite value: *fu venit* (CA, 28); *pogoritu fuse* (TB, 86), *tremurat fu* (CP, 25 r/10, 145 r/3).

2.2.2. *A hyper compound structure* of the compound preterite of the auxiliary *to be + the past participle* (sometimes inflected)[1], denoting the past perfect, is highly encountered in the texts of the 16th century both in translations and in original texts:

[1] Nowadays this periphrasis has a colloquial character being known within all Daco-Romanian dialectal areas (*Ibidem*: 465).

[2] In case of nowadays Romanian, this periphrasis is rarely mentioned within the Wallachian dialectal texts (Marin, *op. cit.*: 466).

BDD-A5874 © 2011 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:58:00 UTC)

amŭ fostŭ cugetatŭ (CCînv, 6); *am fostu cumpărat* (CB, 88; DÎR, LX, 2); *au fost cerut* (DÎR, XXXVI, 250 r/2); *au fost chemat* (DÎR, XXXVI, 250 v/4); *au fost(u) dat* (DÎR, XXXII, 239 r/18, XLVIII, 247 r/3, XLVII, 2-3); *au fost robitu* (DÎR, XIV, 1-2); *au fost scăpat* (DÎR, XVIII*, 1 r/18); *au trimes* (DÎR, XLIV, 238 r/4); *au fostu umblat* (DÎR, XLVII, 2); *au fostŭ zăcutŭ* (CCînv, 58); *amŭ fostŭ muriți* (CCînv, 199); *au fost făcuți* (DÎR, LXXXIX, 1 v/8-9), *au fost grăit* (DÎR, XCIII, 1 r/9); *au fost învățați* (CCînv, 14); *au fost trecuți* (DÎR, XV, 12); *au fost uciş* (DÎR, CXI, 6).

In few cases, this structure occurs discontinuously through the insertion of a pronoun as subject: *Că şi acestŭ bolnavŭ de acmu,* ***n' au fostŭ*** *elu* ***greşitŭ*** *într' atâțea ani în cărți fu muncitŭ cu boala ...* (CCînv, 148).

Conclusions

The 16th-century preterite forms of the indicative mood (the imperfect, the preterite and the past perfect) were expressed both synthetically and analytically.

The analytic structures were formed by an auxiliary –*to be* or *to have*- used in various tenses and verb forms, in the past participle or the gerund form, mainly in an optional word order. These structures could be used discontinuously through the insertion of various elements or even of some complex structures.

As element of the structure, depending on the auxiliary to which it combines, the past participle may be non-inflected or inflected by gender or number morphemes. The inflected past participle structure is a typical characteristic of the Romanian language within the 16th century. Under the same circumstances there have been mentioned forms of the non inflected past participle following the "increased grammaticalization level of the components of a verbal analytic form" (Diaconescu, 1969: 31).

Among these periphrases, only the compound preterite was mentioned by the norms of the written language. Other structures occur even nowadays, at a colloquial and dialectal level, especially within classic idioms.

Bibliography

Densusianu, Ovid, Istoria limbii române, II, Editura Ştiințifică, Bucureşti, 1961.
Diaconescu, Ion, „Modul participiu în limba română din secolele al XVI-lea, al XVII-lea şi al XVIII-lea", în AUB, 1969, nr. 1, p. 25-39.
Dragoş, E., Elemente de sintaxă istorică românească, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, Bucureşti, 1995.
Frâncu, Constantin, Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521-1780), Editura Demiurg, Iaşi, 2009.
Gheție, Ion, Zgraon, Florentina, „Despre aşa-numitele formații premorfologice din limba română veche", în SCL, XXXII, nr. 2, 1981, p. 179-181.
Ionică, Ion, *Subdialectul muntean*, în Rusu, 1984, p. 163-208.
Lăzărescu, Paul, *Subdialectul moldovean*, în Rusu, 1984, p. 208-240.
Livescu, Michaela, *Varietățile diatopice ale limbii române*, Editura Universitaria, Craiova, 2004.
Marin, Maria, „Formes verbales périfrastiques de l'indicatif dans les parlers dacoroumains", în *RRL*, XXX, nr. 5, 1985, p. 459-468.
Marin, Maria, Marinescu, B., *Graiurile din Transilvania*, în Rusu, 1984, p. 354-390.

[1] Nowadays this periphrasis is highly used in the Moldavian idioms; it is frequent in Banat (Neagoe, *op. cit.*: 263), Crişana (Urițescu, *op. cit.*: 309), Transylvania (except the South-Western parts) (Marin, Marinescu, 1984: 376), Maramureş (Vulpe, *op. cit.*: 337) şi the nothen region of Moldavia (Lăzărescu, *op. cit.*: 225); *cf.* Marin, *op. cit.*: 466.

BDD-A5874 © 2011 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:58:00 UTC)

Moldovanu, Dragoş, *Formaţii premorfologice în limba română veche*, în „Anuar de lingvistică şi istorie literară”, tomul XXVI, 1977-1978.
Neagoe, Victorela, *Subdialectul bănăţean*, în Rusu, 1984, p. 240-284.
Rosetti, Alexandru, *Istoria limbii române de la origini până în secolul al XVII-lea*, Editura pentru Literatură, Bucureşti, 1968.
Rusu, Valeriu (coord.), *Tratat de dialectologie*, Editura Scrisul Românesc, Craiova, 1984.
Saramandu, N., *Aromâna*, în Rusu, 1984, p. 423-475.
Uritescu, Dorin, *Subdialectul crişean*, în Rusu, 1984, p. 284-320.
Vulpe, Magdalena, *Subdialectul maramureşean*, în Rusu, 1984, p. 320-354.

Sources

Codicele Voronețean, Ediție critică, studiu filologic şi studiu lingvistic de Mariana Costinescu, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1981 (CV).
Coresi, *Liturghierul*, Text stabilit, studiu introductiv şi indice de Al. Mareş, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, 1969 (CL).
Coresi, *Lucrul Apostolesc* (*Apostolul*), Texte de limbă din secolul XVI reproduse în facsimile îngrijite de I. Bianu, Bucureşti, Tiparul „Cultura Națională”, 1930 (CA).
Coresi, *Carte cu învăţătură (1581)*, publicată de Sextil Puşcariu şi Alexe Procopovici, Bucureşti, Atelierele SOCEC, 1914 (CCînv.).
Coresi, *Întrebare creştinească*, în *Texte româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea.* Ediții critice de Emanuela Buză, Gheorghe Chivu, Magdalena Georgescu, Ion Gheție, Alexandra Roman-Moraru, Florentina Zgraon (coord. Ion Gheție), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1982 (ÎC).
Coresi, *Psaltirea română (*1589*)* în Psaltirea *slavo-română (1577) în comparaţie cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 şi din 1589*, Text stabilit, introducere şi indice de Stela Toma, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1976 (CP).
Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea, Text stabilit şi indice de Gheorghe Chivu, Magdalena Georgescu, Magdalena Ioniță, Alexandru Mareş şi Alexandra Roman-Moraru. Introducere de Alexandru Mareş, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1979 (DÎR).
Drăganu, N., *Două manuscripte vechi, Codicele Teodorescu şi Codicele Marţian*, Bucureşti, Librăriile SOCEC, 1914 (Cod. Teod., Cod. Marţ.).
Gaster, M., *Tetraevanghelul diaconului Coresi din 1561*, Bucureşti, Imprimeriile Statului, 1929 (CT).
Palia de la Orăştie. 1581-1582. Text-facsimile-indice. Ediție îngrijită de Viorica Pamfil, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1968 (PO).
Petriceicu Haşdeu, B., *Cuvente den bătrâni*, I, Ediție îngrijită şi note de G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1984 (CB).
Pravila ritorului Lucaci (1581), Text stabilit, studiu introductiv şi indice de I. Rizescu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1971 (PL).
Psaltirea Scheiană comparată cu celelalte psaltiri din secolele XVI şi XVII traduse din slavoneşte, Ediție critică de I. A. Candrea, Bucureşti, Atelierele SOCEC, 1916 (PS).
Texte măhăcene, în Petriceicu Haşdeu, B., *Cuvente den bătrâni*, II, Ediție îngrijită, studiu introductiv şi note de G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1984, p. 33-191 (TM).
Texte bogomilice, în Petriceicu Haşdeu, B., *Cuvente den bătrâni*, II, Ediție îngrijită, studiu introductiv şi note de G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1984, p. 193-430 (TB).
Texte româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea. Ediții critice de Emanuela Buză, Gheorghe Chivu, Magdalena Georgescu, Ion Gheție, Alexandra Roman-Moraru, Florentina Zgraon (coord. Ion Gheție), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1982.

BDD-A5874 © 2011 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 16:58:00 UTC)