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Abstract
This chapter investigates the relation between syntheticity and analyticity in the history of Romanian. We empirically note that, against the traditional hypothesis that in the passage from Latin to Romance older synthetic forms were extensively replaced by novel analytic formations, there is a set of old Romanian periphrastic constructions which disappeared in the passage to modern Romanian, and we set our goal to provide an explanation for this less frequent linguistic change. By bringing to the fore data from old and modern Romanian, as well as dialectal Daco-Romanian material, we show that the facts are best explained by appealing to structural factors (i.e. the feature matrix of Romanian auxiliaries) rather than functional factors (competition between functionally equivalent forms, learned nature, or rare occurrence in usage).
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8.1 Introduction, outline and minimal theoretical assumptions
Addressing the general relation between syntheticity and analyticity in the passage from Latin to Romance, this chapter analyses the diachronic development of verbal periphrases in the passage from old to modern Romanian, including its dialectal varieties; only Daco-Romanian and its regional varieties are considered in this study, while the sub-Danubian historical dialects have not been taken into account. Our analysis starts from the empirical observation that in the passage from old to modern Romanian, despite the loss of some inherited synthetic formations (see Maiden 2018:29-43), there is a subset of novel periphrastic formations which disappeared from the standard language, with just some relics preserved dialectally.

While traditional scholarship argued that synthetic forms were replaced tout court by analytic formations in the transition from Latin to Romance (cf. Schlegel 1818 and many references thereafter), more recent work has argued against such a radical view (Schwegler 1990; Ledgeway 2012 and, especially, 20171), focusing on the cross-Romance variation in this area and highlighting the particular developments of each Romance variety in turn2. In this respect,

1 Cf. also Coseriu’s (1987, 1988) distinction between ‘internal’ and ‘external’ structures, onto which he develops the hypothesis that that the Romance languages are distinguished from Latin by an iconic typology whereby relational concepts (external structures) receive relational, ‘syntagmatic’ (i.e. analytic) exponence and non-relational concepts (= internal structures) receive non-relational, ‘paradigmatic’ (i.e. synthetic) exponence. As Coseriu himself admits, this principle is not without exceptions.

2 The disappearance of newly coined periphrases is found in other Romance idioms as well. Consider French, for example. The periphrases made up of the verb estre (être) ‘be’ or aller ‘go’ plus a present participle go extinct (Squartini 1999:27; Buridant 2000:357-8); the loss of periphrases whose lexical verb occurs in the gerund is also attested in Italian, Occitan, Galician, and Portuguese (Squartini 1999:28-9). Of the numerous compound auxiliary forms of French – double auxiliary + past participle: j’ai eu fait (I-have.AUX.1SG have.AUX make.PTPC). j’avais eu fait (I-have.AUX(IMPF).1SG have.AUX make.PTPC), j’aurais eu fait (I-have.AUX(COND).1SG have.AUX make.PTPC), etc., see Ayres Bennett & Carruthers (1992) –, the only one which has been preserved in non-standard and regional French (in the south) is the one employing the auxiliary in the compound past (the “passé surcomposé”) – j’ai eu fait, see Carruthers (1994), Apothéloz (2010), Melchior (2012), etc. Note that there is a formal correspondence between this form and a Romanian compound auxiliary form preserved dialectally – am fost dat (have.AUX.1SG be.AUX give.PTCP) (see example (24) below). In the particular case of French, the demise of many of these periphrases might have also been favoured by the fact that they were largely ignored or condemned by the French grammars (Ayres Bennett & Carruthers 1992).
Romanian developed in the course of its history a number of novel periphrastic formations in the verbal domain which, although continuing in many other Romance varieties (cf. Squartini 1998), did not survive into the modern language; older synthetic formations characterized by greater morphemic simplicity (understood as smaller number of morphemes involved) prevailed diachronically. The loss of this subset of periphrases raises some non-trivial problems concerning the broader Romance typological tendencies and the relation between syntheticty and analyticity/periphrasis, hence the main research question to which our analysis seeks to provide an answer is why some novel periphrastic formations disappeared from the language, while others have survived to the present day.

The first three sections of this chapter present an empirical overview of the changes in the verb system from the perspective of the interplay between syntheticity and a subtype of analytic structures (i.e. periphrastic forms), throwing light on the differences between old Romanian (§8.2) and modern standard (§8.3) and dialectal (§8.4) Romanian. These are then addressed from a theoretical perspective (§8.5); our analysis will show that the auxiliaries of these now defunct periphrases share a set of properties concerning the encoding of TAM (i.e. they have a richer feature matrix) which sets them apart from the auxiliaries of the surviving periphrases, this accounting for the demise of the former subset of periphrases.

For the concepts ‘analytic(ity)’ and ‘periphrastic/periphrasis’, we adopt the framework established in the introduction to this volume (see Ledgeway, Smith & Vincent, current volume), ‘periphrasis’ generally referring to a set of analytic forms that realize the cells of an inflexional paradigm that are typically realized by inflexional forms elsewhere in the paradigm; note that not all patterns traditionally included under the heading ‘analytic’ may be considered ‘periphrastic’ (see Ledgeway, Smith & Vincent, current volume; see also §8.5.2 below). In this chapter we focus on periphrases with TAM auxiliaries (as opposed to auxiliaries whose feature matrix encodes other grammatical categories, e.g. voice auxiliaries); we adopt a generally accepted definition of auxiliaries such as that given in Anderson (2006)\(^3\), which is convergent with the general view on auxiliaries in grammaticalization theory (cf. Heine 1993; Kuteva 2001).

Although our analysis is empirically oriented, we adopt the spirit of the rather uncontroversial generative idea (developed by Cinque 1999 and much subsequent literature: see Ledgeway 2012 and Schifano 2018 i.a. for cross-Romance overviews, and Nicolae 2015, 2019 for Romanian) that the inflectional domain (= the structural portion where TAM information is hosted) is made up of three dedicated projections/fields of projections, hierarchically ordered (mood > tense > aspect)\(^4\). Our analysis endorses a compositional view (see Comrie 1985:76 on compositionality in the encoding of TAM, and Vincent 2015 on compositionality and language change), assuming that there is a division of labour between the components of a periphrasis with respect to the encoding of TAM information.

\(^3\) “[A]uxiliaries are not discrete entities per se but rather mono-clausal form–function combinations occupying a non-discrete space on several large form–function continua that include serial verb constructions, clause-chaining, and verb plus complement clause combinations on the one hand and tense-aspect-mood affixes on the other” (Anderson 2006:4).

\(^4\) We adopt a traditional, widely accepted view of the TAM categories; see Comrie (1976) on Aspect, Comrie (1985) on Tense, and Palmer (2001) on Mood.
8.2 Periphrastic forms in old Romanian

Old Romanian is characterized by a larger number of analytic verb forms than modern Romanian, some of which have been considered calques due to the translation of learned texts from Old Church Slavonic or Greek (see Manoliu 1959; Arvinte 1993; but cf. Zafiu 2016:45). However, the fact that they have been preserved in regional varieties of Romanian shows that they are the products of natural and internal linguistic change, and allows us to surmise that they were genuinely present in actual usage in old Romanian. As we shall see, a striking formal characteristic of old Romanian is the systematic correspondence between constructions with the future ‘be’ plus past participle and the ‘be’ plus gerund (present participle) (see §§8.2.2, 8.2.3).

8.2.1 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the infinitive

In the sixteenth century the set of periphrases with the lexical verb occurring as a bare infinitive includes the voi-future (1a) and the aș-conditional (2a), as well as periphrases headed by the auxiliary VREA (‘want’). The direct selection of a bare infinitive generally indicates a high degree of grammaticalization, and hence the fact that they had grammaticalized in an earlier (and unattested) stage of Romanian (Caragiu Mariotceanu 1969:268). This is in contrast to other complex predicates in the sixteenth century where the lexical verb is introduced by the infinitival marker a ‘to’. A more recent and less grammaticalized type of future (rare and gradually abandoned towards the end of the seventeenth century, see Zamfir 2007:232–41) was based on the a-infinitive (1b). The two types of future developed – through two of the main pathways of grammaticalization (see Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994:254–64) – from constructions with VREA ‘want’ (the agent-oriented modality of desire) and AVEA ‘have’ (the agent-oriented modality of obligation, derived from possession). The former was extremely frequent and clearly temporal, while the latter remained rare and preponderantly modal. The auxiliary (1a) was not yet differentiated from lexical ‘want’ from a formal point of view in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

(1) a  
vedea-veri slava lu Dumnezeu
see.INF= want.AUX.2SG glory.DEF GEN God
‘you will see the glory of God’ (CC².1581:99)

b  
de acmu oameni ai a vâna
from now man.PL have.AUX.2SG to hunt.INF
‘from now on you will hunt men’ (CC².1581:367)

5 In agreement with the Romanian philological tradition (see Timotin 2016 and references therein), the period referred to as ‘old Romanian’ stretches roughly from the beginning of the sixteenth century (the period of the earliest attested written documents) to the end of the eighteenth century. The year 1780 is considered the borderline between old and modern Romanian.

6 The idea that these analytic structures are productive and cognate with other Latin-Romance patterns – with learned Old Church Slavonic or Greek influences functioning as a catalyst at a certain point – was promoted by Frâncu (1983-84; 2012; 2014).

7 Traditional grammars discuss these -nd forms under the heading Rom. gerunziu / ‘gerund’. As formatives of periphrases, their actual function is that of a present participle (see Nicula 2013).

8 Glossing conventions. Note that in the glosses the transparent auxiliaries have been translated (e.g. the future auxiliary veri is glossed ‘want.AUX’) as and the opaque ones have received only the structural description (e.g. the conditional auxiliary aș is glosses as ‘AUX.COND’). For auxiliaries, the mood and tense information is only mentioned in the text, not reflected in the interlinear glosses.
There was significant variation in the inventory of periphrases based on the future which initially had the value of a future in the past, later becoming conditionals. The most frequent analytic conditional, which is preserved in present-day Romanian, involves the auxiliary *aș/ai/ăr(ă)/am/ați/ar(ă)* and the bare infinitive (2a). Despite many etymological controversies (including Weigand 1896; Rosetti 1932:104; Philippide 1927; Elson 1992; Ivănescu 1980/2000:163; see Zafiu 2017 for a review), the most plausible hypothesis is that the auxiliary originates from past forms (imperfect, perhaps contaminated with the simple past) of the future auxiliary *VREA* ‘want’. In modern Romanian, the standard analytic form of the conditional (as merge ‘I would go’) has only modal values; presumably, in an earlier period it must have also had a temporal value (as a future in the past), similarly to its equivalents in other languages (see also §8.5.1). A variant of the construction uses the ‘transparent’ auxiliary *VREA* ‘want’ in the imperfect: *vrea/vreai/vream/vreați/vrea* + bare infinitive (2b), with a contextually dependent interpretation, either as a future in the past or as a conditional.

(2) a eu n- aș fi derept
I not= AUX.COND.1SG be.INF right
‘I would not be right’ (CC².1581:93)

b minciuna amu vrea fi aiavea
lie.DEF then want.AUX.3SG be.INF real
‘Then the lie would be real’ (CC².1581:186)

A third, even rarer, analytic form was based on the volitional auxiliary in the compound past (*am vrut/ai vrut/au vrut/am vrut/ați vrut/au vrut*) plus the bare infinitive (3). A

(3) au vrut vrea amu a munci
have.AUX.3PL want.AUX want.INF then to torment.INF
‘then they would have wanted to torment’ (CC².1581:414)

With the exception of the *voi*-future and the *aș*-conditional, all the formations discussed in this section disappeared in the passage from old to (standard) modern Romanian. The now defunct analytic conditional with the ‘transparent’ imperfect of the auxiliary *VREA* ‘want’ is functionally equivalent to the canonical *aș*-conditional, whose form of the auxiliary was no longer transparent. Also, the conditional with *VREA* ‘want’ in the compound past plus bare

---

9 The existence of a future in the past which developed counterfactual and conditional values is well-attested in the Balkan languages, both in diachrony (see, for Greek, Markopoulos 2009:2016-18) and, for Bulgarian, Kuteva (2001:109), and in synchrony. The phenomenon is not conditioned by the absence of SOT/Double Access Reading in the Balkan languages: even if the future in the past is not determined (by a superordinate tense) (cf. D’Hulst, Coene & Avram 2004:357), it is permitted and attested in texts.

10 Some occurrences of this analytic form can be found in the earliest attested Romanian texts (of the sixteenth century), in contexts where it is impossible to assign them a conditional meaning. Densusianu (1938:231-2) interpreted them as mere translation errors (influenced by the Hungarian and Latin sources), i.e. as uses of conditional analytic forms instead of past tense forms. However, it is possible to see them as future in the past periphrases, used in a narrative context.

11 Witness the regularity shown by *VREA* ‘want’ as illustrated by example (3): as an auxiliary, it selects a bare infinitive (*au vrut vrea* ‘they would have wanted’), while as a lexical verb, it selects an *a*-infinitive (*vrea a munci* ‘want to torment’). In the latter construction, the infinitive is systematically replaced by the subjunctive.
infinitive was replaced by the perfect conditional, formed with the ‘opaque’12 auxiliary aș and the invariable auxiliary fi ‘be’ plus past participle (see §8.3 below).

The case of the AVEA ‘have’ + a-infinitive future is different: it was lost as a consequence of the spread of the equivalent construction based on the subjunctive (am să merg have.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG ‘(I) will go’), part of the (incomplete) replacement of the infinitive by the subjunctive in Romanian, a Balkan Sprachbund phenomenon (see also fnt. 11). Other constructions, which we will not discuss here in detail as they do not satisfy the criteria for being considered auxiliary-based configurations of the same structural type (see §8.5.2 for a discussion), originate from the substitution of the infinitive by the subjunctive: voi + infinitive > voi + subjunctive (the o să-future diachronically derives from this structure after the first component became invariable, namely o < *oa [wa] < va ‘wants’, cf. Ivănescu 2000:418); VREA + infinitive > VREA + subjunctive. These constructions featured either double inflexion, both on the auxiliary and on the lexical verb (e.g. am să merg have.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG, voi să merg want.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG ‘I will go’), or simple inflexion, on the lexical verb (o să merg PRT SBJV go.SBJV.1SG ‘I will go’). There are no modal (i.e. grammatical) differences, but only sociolinguistic differences, between these future periphrases in modern Romanian. Only one of each of these periphrastic pairs has been preserved: voi merge want.AUX.1SG go.INF (but not voi să merg want.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG) and am să merg have.AUX.1SG SBJV go.SBJV.1SG (but not am a merge have.AUX.1SG to go.INF); this split most probably occurred as an effect of the different patterns of infinitive-by-subjunctive diachronic replacement (note that the infinitive has not been replaced by the subjunctive across-the-board).

Of the conditional periphrases, only the form made up of an opaque auxiliary with no obvious tense inflection and the infinitive (the aș-conditional) has been preserved in standard Romanian, the structure with an auxiliary which is overtly inflected for tense (vrea/am vrut) having been over time eliminated.

8.2.2 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the past participle
The compound past formed with the auxiliary AVEA ‘have’ (am/ai/a(u)/am/ai/au) (4) was very frequent and fully grammaticalized in the sixteenth century (au mers have.AUX.3SG/pl=go.PTCP / mers-au go.PTCP=have.AUX.3SG/pl ‘he/they went’). The only difference with respect to the modern-day use of the form was its frequency in relation to the simple past inherited from Latin. The simple past is well represented, especially in lemnèd texts, and the opposition between the simple past and the compound past still preserved a semantic basis, the first being a true preterite (i.e. a past punctual perfective form), and the latter functioning more similar to a present perfect in some contexts, although exhibiting a tendency to overlap with the simple past (Zafiu 2016:33-5).

(4)  iară acest bolnav n- au făcut așa, and this ill not= have.AUX.3SG do.PTCP like.this ce și pren târg trecu. but also through town go.IND.PST.3SG ‘And this ill man did not do so, but also went even through the town’ (CC2.1581:56)

---

12 An ‘opaque’ auxiliary is an auxiliary whose relation to its lexical source is no longer transparent due to various historical factors (phonetic erosion, morphological attrition, etc.).
There is a consistent set of periphrases built with the auxiliary fi ‘be’ ((5)-(6)); Old Church Slavonic BE-based periphrases are considered to have influenced the old Romanian BE-based periphrases (Sandfeld 1930:149). In old Romanian it was possible to form periphrases with the past participle and the auxiliary fi ‘be’ in almost all modal and temporal forms, with the exception of the simple past and of the imperative. The periphrasis based on BE in the present indicative (which occurs mostly with, but is not restricted to, unaccusatives) – interpreted as a BE-based compound past/present perfect (Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2013) or as a copula verb + predicative – is very infrequent (Zamfir 2007:74), hence it has not been considered in our analysis.

The auxiliary had a synthetic form in the imperfect (5a), the pluperfect (5b), the subjunctive (5c) and the synthetic conditional (5d). The periphrasis with the auxiliary in the imperfect had the value of a pluperfect (Densusianu 1938:224). The periphrasis with the auxiliary in the subjunctive, which had the value of a perfect subjunctive, was attested in the sixteenth century; the auxiliary later became completely invariable in the nineteenth century (Frâncu 1970). Extremely rare was the construction with the auxiliary in the synthetic conditional. This form, which resulted from a mixture of Latin perfect subjunctive and future perfect (like the Ibero-Romance future subjunctive), disappeared after the sixteenth century (Maiden et al 2021:296). The ephemeral periphrases with the auxiliary in the gerund (5e) emerged in the seventeenth century (Niculescu 2016:275), and those with the auxiliary in the infinitive (5f) emerged later (in the eighteenth c., probably replicating the pattern of the perfect subjunctive, Frâncu 2009:321).

(5) a au cetitu ce era have.AUX.3SG read.PTCP what be.AUX.3PL
   ei scris
   they.NOM write.PTCP
   ‘He read what they had written’ (CC\(^1\).1567:2\(^v\))

   b rugu-l fusese văzut [pe drac] briar=CL.ACC.3MSG be.AUX.3SG see.PTCP DOM devil
   ‘the briar had seen him (= the devil)’ (CS\(_{VI}\).1590-602:60\(^r\))

   c să fim noi iubit pre Dumnezeu SBJV be.AUX.1PL we love.PTCP DOM God
   ‘that we have loved God’ (CC\(^1\).1567:25\(^r\))

   d se fure faptu păcatu, lăsa-se va if be.AUX do.PTCP sin forgive.INF= CL.REFL= want.AUX.3SG
   lui him.DAT
   ‘if he sinned, he will be forgiven’ (CV.1563-83:57\(^v\))

   e fiind avut cu dânsul și o căruță be.AUX have.PTCP with him also a carriage
   ‘having also had a carriage with him’ (DC.a.1794:94)

   f vede-să a fi trăit see.IND.PRES.3SG=CL.REFL to be.AUX live.PTCP
   înaintea lui Lameh before GEN Lameh
   ‘he seems to have lived before Lameh’ (ACT.1709:249)
There were also constructions with the auxiliary FI ‘be’ in an analytic form: the double compound past (6a), the future perfect (6b), the perfect conditional headed by the opaque auxiliary aș (6c) and its less frequent variant with the transparent auxiliary VREA ‘want’ (6d), as well as the double compound subjunctive (6e). We witness recurring patterns of formation, so that an analytic form can even have three auxiliary verbs: witness the compound perfect conditional (6f), the compound future perfect (6g), and the compound perfect conditional, built with the opaque aș (6h) and transparent VREA (6i) auxiliaries.

(6) a mulți amu oameni au fost făcut many then people have.AUX.3PL be.AUX do.PTCP bunătăți good.deeds ‘then many people had done good deeds’ (CC².1581:44)

b lucrurile ce va fi lucrat things.DEF which want.AUX.3SG be.AUX complete.PTCP pre ceastă lume in this world ‘the things he will have completed in this world’ (CC².1581:120)

c de n-ară fi pipăit, n-ară if not=AUX.COND.3SG be.AUX touch.PTCP not=AUX.COND.3SG fi nici crezut be.AUX neither believe.PTCP ‘If he had not touched it, he would not have even believed’ (CC².1581:141)

d nu vrea fi tăcut de acesta not want.AUX.3SG be.AUX be.silent.PTCP of this evangelistul evangelist.DEF ‘the evangelist would not have kept silent about this’ (CC².1581:267)

e să fie fost trăit într-însul SBJV be.AUX.3SG be.AUX live.PTCP in-him cu pace (NL.~1750-66:3) with peace ‘they should have lived in it (= the land) in peace’

f Pătru au vrut fi zis Peter have.AUX.3SG want.AUX be.AUX say.PTCP ‘Peter would have said’ (CC².1581:151)

g dă se va fi făcut sărutare, if CL.REFL.PASS want.AUX.3SG be.AUX do.PTCP kiss ori dă nu să va fi fost or if not CL.REFL.PASS want.AUX.3SG be.AUX be.AUX făcut do.PTCP ‘if one had kissed or not’ (Prav.1652:176)

h de-ară fi fost înțelegut if=AUX.COND.3SG be.AUX be.AUX understand.PTCP ‘if he would have understood’ (CPr.1566:287)
The future perfect was also used with a modal and evidential value as a perfect of the ‘epistemic future’, expressing suppositions about past events. The periphrasis with \( \text{fi} \) ‘be’ in the imperfect (i.e. the analytic pluperfect) was frequent in the sixteenth century (Pamfil 1973; Zamfir 2007:196-200). The periphrasis with the auxiliary in the compound past (\( \text{am fost} \) have.AUX.1SG be.AUX(PTCP) + PTCP), frequent until the eighteenth century (Pamfil 1973; Zamfir 2007:37-62) and preserved in the dialects to the present day (see §8.4.2 below), has been considered a second analytic pluperfect by some scholars (Densusianu 1938:224), but its uses were not always equivalent with those of an anaphoric ‘past in the past’. It seems to have had a mainly aspectual value, emphasizing the perfectivity, as did the compound auxiliary forms (with the \( \text{BE} \) auxiliary) of Old Neapolitan, described by Ledgeway (2009:596-8)\(^{13}\), corresponding therefore to the ‘perfect in the past’, according to the distinction in Squartini (1999). The periphrases with the auxiliary in the conditional (the synthetic \( \text{fure} \) (5d), the analytic \( \text{as f\i} \) (6c)/\( \text{vrea f\i} \) (6d) or the double analytic \( \text{am vrut fi} \) (6f)) function as variants of the perfect conditional. The set of forms which contain three auxiliary verbs includes: the future perfect (\( \text{voi fi fost + participle} \) (6g) (Zamfir 2007:258-9), the main perfect conditional (\( \text{as f\i} \) fi fost + participle) (6h) (Zamfir 2007:336, 339; Frâncu 2009:124) and also the type \( \text{vrea f\i} \) fi fost + participle (6i), and the perfect subjunctive (\( \text{s\a f\i fost + participle} \) (6e), attested in old Romanian since the seventeenth century (Zamfir 2005:415; Frâncu 2010:121-3). Many of these formations ((6a), (6e), (6g), (6h), (6i)) contain \( \text{fi} \) ‘be’ in the past participle (i.e. \( \text{fost} \)), and this presumably contributes a supplementary degree of perfectivity, converted into pastness/anteriority.\(^{14}\)

Only the analytic forms with the auxiliary in the imperfect, the compound past, the subjunctive, and the conditional were frequent in early texts. And only the perfect subjunctive (\( \text{ai} \)), (\( \text{ii} \))\( \text{c} \), the future perfect (\( \text{ii} \))\( \text{a} \), (\( \text{iii} \))\( \text{a} \), the conditional perfect (\( \text{ii} \))\( \text{b} \), (\( \text{iii} \))\( \text{b} \), and the perfect infinitive (\( \text{ii} \)), (\( \text{ii} \))\( \text{c} \) were retained (§8.3). In modern Romanian, these forms contain the invariable auxiliary \( \text{fi} \) ‘be’, which has two diachronic sources. With most of the forms, invariable \( \text{fi} \) ‘be’ originates from the bare infinitive form of ‘be’. One the other hand, with the perfect subjunctive, it originates from an inflected form (‘be’ in the present subjunctive), which displayed variation in person and number (\( \text{ii} \))\( \text{d} \); later, in the nineteenth century, the inflexional endings were stripped off and the auxiliary became invariable by analogy with the other forms (the perfect conditional, the future perfect) where ‘be’ is invariable (see also example (34) and discussion in §8.5.1) (\( \text{ii} \))\( \text{d} \). This change created a structural correspondence between the perfect subjunctive and the other analytic \( \text{BE} \) perfects, even if subjunctive \( \text{s\a} \) is an invariable particle, not an auxiliary.

\(^{13}\) The same compound auxiliary pattern, but with the auxiliary \( \text{HAVE} \), has been attested in Friulan, Occitan, French, Catalan, Raeto-Romance and northern Spanish varieties (Ledgeway 2009; Melchior 2012; De Saussure & Sthioul 2012). The French \( \text{surcomposé} \) forms, which are still in use, have different values in the informal register and in the regional varieties (see Carruthers 1994; Apothéloz 2010; Melchior 2012, i.a.).

\(^{14}\) This raises important questions about the degree to which ‘compositionality’ plays a part in diachronic change (see Vincent 2015), that are worthwhile exploring in future work.
old Romanian

(i)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{voi/ve(r)i/va/vom (v(r)em)/v(r)eți/vor} & \text{fi} & \text{participle} \\
b. & \text{aș/ai/ar(ă)/am/ați/ar(ă)} & \text{fi} & \text{participle} \\
c. & \text{a} & \text{fi} & \text{participle} \\
d. & \text{să} & \text{fiu / fii / fie / fim / fiți / fie} & \text{participle}
\end{align*}

modern Romanian

(ii)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{voi/vei/va/veți/vor} & \text{fi} & \text{participle} \\
b. & \text{aș/ai/ar(ă)/am/ați/ar} & \text{fi} & \text{participle} \\
c. & \text{a} & \text{fi} & \text{participle} \\
d. & \text{să} & \text{fi} & \text{participle}
\end{align*}

The non-passive periphrases made up of BE plus past participle also underwent an important change: although in the sixteenth century this pattern frequently shows agreement, in the next centuries it appears without agreement (Dragomirescu 2014; 2016:263). Statistically, if the masculine singular forms are not considered (since it is impossible to say whether there is agreement or not) and we factor in the masculine plural and the feminine forms, then, in the sixteenth century, approximatively 50% of the periphrases made up of BE and the past participle show agreement (Dragomirescu 2016:264, 270). Notably, this form of gender and number agreement of the past participle with the subject does not depend on the class of the lexical verb; what is constant is the identity of the auxiliary: agreement shows up only in the BE-periphrases.

Therefore, in contrast to most Romance varieties, transitive (7), unaccusative (8) and unergative (9) verbs show past participial agreement with the subject in BE-periphrases:

(7)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{și ceia ce vor hi făcuți aceasta} \\
& \text{and those what want.AUX.3PL be.AUX.do.PTCP.MPL this.F.SG} \\
& \text{‘and those who would have done that’ (Prav.1581:258)} \\
b. & \text{și ceia ce vor fi botezați} \\
& \text{and those who want.AUX.3PL be.AUX.christen.PTCP.MPL finul (Prav.1581:242)} \\
& \text{godson.DEF.ACC} \\
& \text{‘and those who will have christened their godson’}
\end{align*}

(8)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{au fost trecuți ai de la Adamu} \\
& \text{have.AUX.3PL be.AUX.pass.PTCP.MPL years from Adam} \\
& \text{până acmu 7105 until now 7105} \\
& \text{‘7105 years have passed from Adam until now’ (DÎ.1597:XV)} \\
b. & \text{păscarii era ieșiți dentr-însele,} \\
& \text{fishermen.DEF be.AUX.3PL go.out.PTCP.MPL from-those} \\
& \text{spăla mreaaja wash.PRES.3PL.toils.DEF} \\
& \text{‘the fishermen were out of there, they were washing the toils’ (CC.1567: 110)}
\end{align*}

(9)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{și încă foarte departe n-ară fi merși} \\
& \text{and yet very far not=AUXCOND.3PL be.AUX go.PTCP.MPL} \\
& \text{‘and they would have not gone too far’ (PO.1582:155)} \\
b. & \text{Că acești oameni orbi era auziți} \\
& \text{that these people.MPL blind.MPL be.AUX.3PL hear.PTCP.MPL}
\end{align*}
‘these blind people had heard the news’ (CC¹.1567:55")

‘after they lived for ten years in the land of Canaan’ (PO.1582:52)

8.2.3 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the gerund/present participle

Old Romanian has a series of periphrases formed with auxiliary ʹbeʹ and the gerund, in parallel with the periphrases formed with the past participle just reviewed in §8.2.2. There are even isolated forms whose participle-based counterpart is not attested: with the auxiliary in the simple past (10c) (see also Zamfir 2007:75-6) and the imperative (10g). The original value of this pattern must have been the progressive one, even if the available textual evidence does not allow us to identify a clear aspectual contrast.

The auxiliary exhibited a synthetic form in the present indicative (10a) (see also Zamfir 2007:74f.), the imperfect (10b), the simple past (10c), the pluperfect (10d), the subjunctive (10e) – which was attested since the seventeenth century (Zamfir 2005:415ff.; Niculescu 2013:158) –, and the extremely rare synthetic conditional (10f) or the imperative (10g). The construction in (10h), with the invariable auxiliary ʹbeʹ, is a late innovation (nineteenth century), whose emergence is probably due to analogy with the past participle periphrasis (see §8.2.2) (Niculescu 2013:166f.).

(10) a vor chema numele lui Emmanuel, carele
want.AUX.3PL call.INF name.DEF GEN Emmanuel which.DEF
iaste tâlmăcindu-se „Cu noi Dumnezeu”
be.AUX.3SG interpret.GER=CL.REFL.PASS with us.ACC
‘they shall call his name Emmanuel, which means “God with us”’ (BB.1688:751)

b în vreamea acea era Isusu învăţându
in time.DEF that be.AUX.3SG Jesus.NOM teach.GER
în besearecă întru o sămbătă
in church in a Saturday/Sabbath
‘Jesus was then teaching in a church on the Sabbath’ (CC².1581:406)

c fum veselindu-
be.AUX.1PL be.glad.GER= CL.ACC.1PL
‘(we) were glad’ (PS.1573‒8:273)

d patr-înş-l fusease purtând
four.people=CL.ACC.M.3SG be.AUX.3PL carry.GER
‘four people had carried him’ (CC².1581:54)

e dă veai vedea pe vreun păcătos [...] if want.AUX.3SG see.INF DOM any sinner
să fie petrecând bine
be.AUX.3SG feast.GER well
‘if you see a sinner having a good time’ (Prav.1652:613)
să fure întru voi lăcuind if be.AUX.2SG in you.PL live.GER ‘if he lived in you’ (CPr.1566:194)

fii tocmindu-te cu be.AUX.2SG negotiate.GER=CL.REFL.2SG with părâșul tău (...)! your plaintiff
‘negotiate with your plaintiff’ (BB.1688:753)

găzduim cu be.AUX.2SG=-REFL.2SG = live.PL with părâșul tău (...)!

‘if he lived in you’ (CPr.1566:194)

pare a nu mai fi existând nici o seem.IND.PRES.3SG to not more be.AUX.exist.GER not one idee serioasă

‘it seems that there is no longer any serious idea’ (EOXIII.1882:229)

Constructions are attested in which the auxiliary is itself an analytic form, occurring in the compound past (11a), the future (11b), the as-conditional (11c), the vrea-conditional (11d), and the perfect subjunctive (11e). The most frequent was the analytic form with the auxiliary in the compound past (Zamfir 2007:62-74). Structures with three auxiliaries are also found, where the first auxiliary is itself an analytic form; these include a vrea ‘want’ conditional form (11f), a future perfect (11g) (cf. Zamfir 2007:258), and a conditional perfect (11h) (cf. Zamfir 2007:345).

(11) a câţi draci au fost având how.many devil.PL have.AUX.3SG be.AUX have.GER

întru el inside him
‘how many devils he had inside himself’ (CC².1581:422)

b de vor fi şi nescari nevoi ţiind if want.AUX.3PL be.AUX also some troubles keep.GER

pre noi DOM us
‘if any troubles will befall us’ (CC².1581:306)

c de n-aţi fi având lucrure bune if not=AUX.COND.2PL be.AUX have.GER thing.PL good.PL

‘if you didn’t have good things’ (CC².1581:526)

d fi-vreaţi ştiind be.AUX=want.AUX.2PL know.GER

‘you would know’ (CC².1581:526)

e varvarii [...] să fie fost ţiind Barbarians.DEF SBJV be.AUX.3PL be.AUX hold.GER

‘Barbarians should have held’ (CH.1717-23:342)

f. am vrut fi ţiind have.AUX.1PL want.AUX be.AUX be.GER

‘we would be’ (CT.1560–1:51f)

15 This structure is the unambiguous result of a loan translation from the Greek original, where the sequence ἵσθι εὖνοω is made up of the imperative of the verb ἵσθι and a present participle. Cf. https://biblehub.com/interlinear/matthew/5-25.htm [accessed on 12/21/2020].
The functional value (mood and tense) of the progressive periphrases generally was the one supplied by their auxiliary, the periphrasis being equivalent to the present, the imperfect, the future, the conditional, etc. They gradually fell into disuse in the passage from old to modern Romanian. Contemporary Romanian preserves only the analytic forms which are the counterpart of the \textit{fi}-perfects, i.e. the future (11b), the subjunctive (10e), the conditional (11c), and the infinitive (10h). These forms gradually specialized for specific epistemic uses of the future, the subjunctive, the conditional, the infinitive, but only the future periphrasis has a significant frequency and a certain degree of stability as a modal form (part of the so-called ‘presumptive mood’ – Zafiu 2013:53-3).

Particular hypotheses have been formulated for the disappearance of certain periphrases, including competition between functionally equivalent forms and bookish (learnèd) nature. For example, Frâncu (1983-84; 2014) suggests that the jettisoning of some older periphrases was determined by deliberate attempts to modernize the standard language in the nineteenth century (which is reflected also by their elimination from some influential grammars); also, they have been taken to be bookish (learnèd) forms, i.e. artificial forms with no real circulation. In §8.5 below, by contrast, we formulate an analysis which privileges structural factors as an explanation for the demise of these forms.

On the whole, the following features distinguish old Romanian analytic structures from those of modern Romanian:

- they are more numerous in previous stages of the language, but they have different frequencies which reflect different degrees of stability;
- those with the \textit{fi} ‘be’ auxiliary are built on a pattern which allows for the recurrent extension of the structure;
- the auxiliary \textit{fi} ‘be’ appears as inflected for tense (and aspect);
- the auxiliary \textit{fi} ‘be’ is not restricted to irrealis forms, but also occurs with different tenses of the indicative.

8.3 Analytic forms in modern Romanian

The TAM system of modern standard Romanian has six synthetic forms: the present indicative, the simple past, the pluperfect indicative, the imperfect indicative, the present subjunctive, and the imperative. The analytic forms are the compound past, three competing paradigms with future value, the future perfect, the present and perfect conditional, the perfect subjunctive, the perfect infinitive, and three marginal periphrases (the presumptive periphrases) specialized for the epistemic values of the future, the subjunctive, and the conditional (see Zafiu 2013). Depending on the non-finite or finite form of the main verb, standard Romanian shows four types of analytic forms which use the infinitive, the past participle and the gerund (present participle), and the subjunctive, respectively.

The periphrases which use the infinitive are the \textit{voi}-future (dubbed ‘the literary future’ in the Romanian grammatical tradition), which is also the oldest type of future, and the conditional. The auxiliary of the future (12a) preserves older forms (1sg \textit{voi}, 3sg. \textit{va}, 3pl \textit{vor}) and simplified forms...
(2sg vei, 1pl vom, 2pl veți) of the present tense of the verb VREA ‘want’, while the paradigm of the lexical verb has been analogically regularized on the model of the root in 1pl vrem and 2pl vreți – witness the forms 1sg vreau, 2sg vrei, 3sg vrea (Maiden et al 2021:362-3). The conditional auxiliary (12b) has opaque forms which have generated etymological controversies: they present a certain similarity to forms of AVEA ‘have’, but almost certainly (according to an old explanation, revived in Zafiu 2017) derive from past forms of the same auxiliary ‘want’ (see also §8.2.1 above).

(12) a) voi/vei/va/vom/veți/vor merge
     want.AUX.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL go.INF

b) aș/ai/ar/am/ți/ăr merge
     AUX.COND.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL go.INF

The periphrases involving the past participle of the lexical verb are heterogeneous. The only pattern formed with the auxiliary AVEA ‘have’ is the compound past (13a). The other set of forms with a participial lexical verb are formed with the invariable auxiliary FI (‘be’), interpreted as an irrealis auxiliary by Avram & Hill (2007) (see Ledgeway 2015 for a finer-grained distinction). In one set of constructions, i.e. in the perfect subjunctive (13b) and the perfect infinitive (13c), FI ‘be’ is preceded by invariable particles (să and a). In another set of forms, the first element in the cluster is a proper (inflected) auxiliary, i.e. the future auxiliary voi in the future perfect (13d) and the conditional auxiliary aș in the conditional perfect (13c).

(13) a) am/ai/a/am/ți/au mers
     have.AUX.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL go.PTCP

b) să fi mers
     SBJV be.AUX go.PTCP

c) a fi mers
     to be.AUX go.PTCP

d) voi/vei/va/vom/veți/vor fi mers
     want.AUX.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL be.AUX go.PTCP

e) aș/ai/ar/am/ți/ăr fi mers
     AUX.COND.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL be.AUX go.PTCP

In fact, the aspectual difference between future and future perfect, and between present conditional and perfect conditional is reanalysed in contemporary Romanian as a difference between the present infinitive and the perfect infinitive (made up of the invariable auxiliary FI ‘be’ + past participle): 16

(14) a) voi [merge] vs. voi [fi mers]
     want.AUX.1SG go.INF

b) aș [merge] vs. aș [fi mers]
     AUX.COND.1SG go.INF

---

16 The interpretation of the perfect conditional and of the perfect future as being made up of auxiliary (aș or voi) plus perfect infinitive is adopted, for example, in Avram (1999:40), D’Hulst, Coene & Avram (2004) and Nicolae (2015:82f.).
The subjunctive and the infinitive can be analysed along similar, yet not fully identical, lines; although from an inflexional perspective, the opposition between the present subjunctive and the perfect subjunctive is not of the same type as that between the present infinitive and the perfect infinitive (the subjunctive displays an opposition between a variable/finite form in the present and an invariable/non-finite sequence in the perfect), from a distributional point of view the present subjunctive and the perfect subjunctive make up a minimal pair.

(15) a a [merge] to go.INF vs. a [fi mers] to be.AUX go.PTCP
b să [merg] SBJV go.SBJV.1SG vs. să [fi mers] SBJV be.AUX go.PTCP

Periphrases with fi ‘be’ + gerund (present participle) are the perfect counterpart of the ‘be’ + past participle constructions. They are rare in present-day Romanian; only the construction with the future of the auxiliary (16a) is more frequent; it is specialized for the epistemic value of the future, partially grammaticalized as a form in the presumptive paradigm. The others, learned and extremely rare (almost extinct), are variants of the present subjunctive (16b), of the infinitive (16c), and of the present conditional (16d), specialized for expressing epistemic uses of the subjunctive, the infinitive, and the conditional, respectively.17 The original progressive value of these periphrases (§8.2.3) has been lost, but there is an acknowledged diachronic relation between the progressive and epistemic values (Heine 1995; Anthonissen, De Wit & Mortelmans 2016; see Bertinetto 2000 for a particular view on Romance) which eventually paved the way for the reinterpretation of these periphrases as epistemic forms.

(16) a (v)oi fi mergând want.AUX.2SG be.AUX go.GER
b să fi mergând SBJV be.AUX go.GER
c a fi mergând to be.AUX go.GER
d aș fi mergând AUXCOND.1SG be.AUX go.GER

This pattern can be interpreted as having the same segmentation (formal analysis) as the perfect series:

(17) a (v)oi [fi mergând] want.AUX.1SG be.AUX go.GER vs. voi [fi mers] want.AUX.1SG be.AUX go.PTCP
b să [fi mergând] SBJV be.AUX go.GER vs. să [fi mers] SBJV be.AUX go.PTCP

17 The label presumptive mood is inconsistently used in the literature, sometimes for the partly specialized Romanian epistemic future, which has three paradigms – present of fi (want.AUX.1SG be.AUX and (v)oi fi fiind (want.AUX.1SG be.AUX be.GER), perfect (v)oi fi fost (want.AUX.1SG be.AUX be.PTCP) (Zafiu 2013:53f.) – and at other times for all the gerund periphrases which have been preserved and specialized with an epistemic value (Niculescu 2013), and in some cases for specific combinations of these categories.
Periphrases with the subjunctive of the lexical verb are more recent and reflect the phenomenon of replacement of the infinitive by the subjunctive, typical of the Balkan Sprachbund (cf. Sandfeld 1930). They are alternative paradigms of the future, only partially accepted by the standard language: one of them (18a) reflects a common Balkan pattern (invariable particle o (< *oa [wa] < va ‘wants’) + verb in the subjunctive). The type in (18b) is made up of the auxiliary HAVE + verb in the subjunctive. There is an important difference between the future in (12a) and the future in (18a): inflexion (in number and person) is marked on the auxiliary in the first case, but on the main verb in the second; (18b) features inflexion on both components.

(18)  a  o să merg/mergi/meargă/mergem/mergeți/meargă (3pl also: or să meargă)  
      PRT SBJV go.SBJV.PRES.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL  
  b  am/ai/are/avem/aveți/au să  
      have.IND.PRS.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL SBJV  
      merg/mergi/meargă/mergem/mergeți/meargă  
      go.PRS.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL  

The auxiliary in (18b) has the same forms as lexical HAVE: occurrence in actual usage is uneven, in that the 1pl and 2pl and 3sg are infrequent in comparison to the frequent 1sg, 2sg and 3pl (Berea-Găgeanu 1972). Modern Romanian uses a learned future in the past formed with the same auxiliary in the imperfect (19).

(19)  aveam/aveai/avea/aveam/aveai/aveau să  
      have.IND.IMPF.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL SBJV  
      merg/mergi/meargă/mergem/mergeți/meargă  
      go.SBJV.PRS.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL  

The analytic forms in (18) and (19) are not of the same structural type as the other (auxiliary-based) analytic structures introduced in this section, as the lexical verb is an inflected (not a non-finite) form; §8.5.2 takes up this issue in more detail.

For a classification of modern Romanian analytic forms, see Maiden et al. (2021:369-82); for a summary of the differences between Romanian and Western Romance, see D’Hulst, Coene & Avram (2004:362-5).

8.4 Analytic forms in the (Daco-)Romanian dialectal varieties
Besides the forms of standard (modern) Romanian, dialectal data reveal that certain periphrastic verb forms have been preserved.

8.4.1 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the infinitive
The analytic conditional with a ‘transparent’ auxiliary is preserved in a few isolated areas. The pattern vrea ‘want’ in the imperfect + infinitive has been found in several areas of the dialect of Banat (20a) (Neagoe 1984:264), Crișana and Maramureș (20b) (Marin 2000:202).
the south of Crișana, an area adjacent to Banat, there is an analytic conditional composed of an invariable third-person singular form of the auxiliary and the infinitive (20c) (Urițescu 1984:310).

(20)  a  reaș merge
    want.AUX.I SG go.INF
    ‘I would go’
  b  Urătu satului ve vorbi
    ugly.DEF village.DEF.GEN want.AUX.3 SG speak.INF
    cu Mândra satului
    with beautiful.DEF village.DEF.GEN
    ‘The village ugly would speak with the village beauty’
  c  vrę mę no aclo
    want.AUX.1 PL go.INF we there
    ‘We would go there’

The pattern with the compound past of the auxiliary VREA ‘want’, rarely attested in old Romanian, is occasionally found in Crișana, Sălaj, and Maramureș (Marin 2000:202; Marin et al. 2017:47; cf. Uritescu 1984:310):

(21)  a  te- ai vu supăra
    CL.REFL.2 SG = have.AUX.2 SG want.AUX get.upset.INF
    ‘you would get upset’
  b  dacă am vrut ști, plecam
    if have.AUX.1 SG want.AUX know.INF leave.IND.IMPF.1 SG
    ‘had I known, I would have left’

The future consisting of the auxiliary AVEA ‘have’ with the same inflexion as the corresponding lexical verb and followed by an a-infinitive has been preserved in Bucovina and Maramureș (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:111).

(22)  a  n- aveți a mântui repede cu mine
    not= have.AUX.2 PL to finish.INF fast with me.ACC
    ‘You won’t finish fast with me’
  b  unde avem a durmi?
    where have.AUX.1 PL to sleep.INF
    ‘where are we going to sleep?’

8.4.2 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the past participle
The periphrasis with FI ‘be’ in the imperfect and a past participle showing agreement (of the same type as that of old Romanian, cf. (8b), (9c) in §8.2.2 above) survived in regional varieties in the west, the north, but also the south (Marin 1985:463; 2005-7:117-9):

(23)  nu era mutați acasă la ei
    not be.AUX.3 PL move.PTCP.MPL home at them
    ‘they had not moved to their place’
The periphrasis with \textit{fi} ‘be’ in the compound past is better preserved in non-standard Romanian, in all areas, even in the south (an area which shows the smallest degree of analyticity in the verbal domain) (Lăzărescu 1984:225; Marin 1985; 2005-07:119f.; Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998; Mărgărit & Neagoe 1997; Neagoe 1992a:83; 1992b:163; Uriteșcu 1984:309; Vulpe 1984:337). Its temporal value depends on the context: it can be interpreted either as a pluperfect, or as a compound past, depending on the context (cf. (24) from Neagoe 1992a:83), the latter reading actually confirming Ledgeway’s (2009:598) observation that the Romance compound auxiliary forms are conditioned and optional variants of the correspondent simple (i.e. not compound) auxiliary forms.

(24) a apă una am fost dat-o
then one have.AUX.1SG be.AUX give.PTCP= CL.ACC.F.3SG
la muiere
at wife
‘then I gave one to my wife’

b n-o fo avut zăce ani
not=have.AUX.3SG be.AUX have.PTCP ten years
‘he wasn’t ten years old yet’

Even the rare periphrases with \textit{fi} ‘be’ in the pluperfect have some regional descendants in the south (Marin 1985:466; 2005-7:121):

(25) Să duc… unde fusese Marin
CL.REFL go.IND.PRES.3SG where be.AUX.3SG Marin
tras pull.PTCP
‘He is going where Marin had spent the night’

The conditional perfect, \textit{vreaș} + \textit{fi} ‘be’+ past participle, is still attested in the Valea Almăjului area (an isolated rural region in Banat) and in the north-western part of Oltenia (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:112):

(26) parcă mai vreaș fi șezut acolo
seems more want.AUX.1SG be.AUX stay.PTCP there
‘I would have kind of preferred to stay there longer’

The periphrastic form with \textit{fi} ‘be’ in the subjunctive + past participle (with agreement)\footnote{It is not clear whether this is a genuine participle agreement or whether it preserves the archaic -\textit{ă} invariable past participle ending in -\textit{ă}, syncretic with the singular feminine form of the past participle (Uriteșcu 2007), also attested in the old language, in periphrastic forms with the auxiliary \textit{be} (Dragomirescu 2016: 269-70), extremely rarely with \textit{have} (Densusianu 1961 II:143).} was preserved in the north-western part of Oltenia, the west of Crișana and the Apuseni Mountains (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:112):
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8.4.3 Periphrases with the lexical verb in the gerund/present participle

The periphrasis with the auxiliary \( \text{Fi} \) ‘be’ in the imperfect followed by the gerund of the lexical verb is rarely attested in the south (Marin 1985:459; 2005-07:115; 2012:20):

(28) [...] **erau trecând printr-o pădure**

\[ \text{be.AUX.3PL cross.GER through-a forest} \]

‘they were crossing a forest’

The periphrasis with the auxiliary \( \text{Fi} \) ‘be’ in the compound past is preserved with a low frequency in Wallachia, Dobrogea, Oltenia, Banat, and several areas of Transylvania (Marin 1985; 2005-07:112-114; 2012; 2014; Neagoe 1984:263; 1992a:83; 1992b:163; Urițescu 1984:308; Vulpe 1984:336):

(29) **ăst unchiaș a fost având un fecior**

\[ \text{this old.man have.AUX.3SG be.AUX have.GER a son} \]

‘this old man had a son’

An atypical construction involving the invariable auxiliary \( o \) and the gerund (30), which has the value of an imperfect or of a perfect, is attested in Banat (Neagoe 1984:263). The form of this construction can be explained by the loss of the past participle \( \text{fost} \) (from \( o \text{ fost dând} \)); it was probably preserved by analogy with the past participle periphrases \( (o \text{ fost dat}, \text{cf.}, \text{for example, (24))} \).

(30) **o dând**

\[ \text{have.AUX give.GER} \]

‘he was giving’

The periphrases specialized for expressing the epistemic (presumptive) value are attested with the auxiliary in the future (31a) or in the conditional (31b), but, in contrast to standard Romanian, the gerund can have a ‘feminine’ form (Marin, Mărgărit & Neagoe 1998:113; see Maiden et al. 2021:340-1 for details with respect to this ‘feminine’ gerund).

(31) a. **nu ştiu cum s-o fi făcândă**

\[ \text{not know.IND.PRS.1SG how CL.REFL.PASS=PRT be.AUX do.GER.FSG} \]

‘I don’t know how it would be made’

b. **zicea că ar fi avândă**

\[ \text{say.IMPF.3SG that AUX.COND.3SG be.AUX have.GER.FSG} \]

‘he was saying that he would be having’

8.5 An account of the partial loss of analyticity in Romanian verbal morphology

The aim of this section is to argue that the group of now defunct auxiliary-based forms share a set of properties which distinguishes them from the auxiliary-based forms which have been diachronically preserved.
On the one hand, we see that, on the surface, change is driven by a principle of inflexional simplification, which is, in turn, the effect of structural factors which have to do with the division of labour between the auxiliary verb and the lexical verb in the marking of T(ense)-A(spect)-M(ood) categories. In particular, we argue that the feature matrix of auxiliaries in the now defunct periphrases is richer and includes tense features along with mood features, while the auxiliaries of the forms which have been diachronically preserved have an impoverished feature matrix, devoid of tense features. In the latter periphrases, assuming a compositional analysis of TAM encoding (cf. Comrie 1985:76), the tense specification is provided by the morphology of the lexical verb; Romanian verbal participles have been analysed as encoding perfective aspective and past tense (Stati 1965:195; D’Hulst, Coene & Avram 2004:360, 364 i.a.); cf. also Comrie 1985:65ff on the featural make up of (verbal) participles. The idea that modern Romanian auxiliaries do not inflect for tense has been previously advanced by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), D’Hulst, Coene & Avram (2004) and Nicolae (2015).

On the other, we see that other analytic forms (some of them analytic but not periphrastic, see Ledgeway, Smith & Vincent, current volume) are not affected by the changes which act upon auxiliary-based structures, hence they are more stable diachronically, as they show distinct properties and a different division of labour in TAM marking (§8.5.2); should changes occur, these act upon the auxiliary/auxiliary sequence internal to them.

8.5.1 Demise of a subset of periphrastic forms
When comparing the now defunct forms with the forms which have been diachronically preserved, we observe that the former are more complex than the latter from an inflexional point of view. Thus, the inflexionally complex forms fall into several types according to the structure of the first auxiliary:

(a) forms whose BE or WANT auxiliary displays mood and tense inflection (32): BE occurs in the indicative present (32a), imperfect (32b), simple past (32c), pluperfect (32d), conditional/future (32e), present subjunctive (32f), and the imperative (32g), or as a non-finite form (a gerund) (32h); WANT occurs in the imperfect indicative (32i); and:

(b) forms whose BE or WANT auxiliary occurs as an analytic form (33), hence the periphrastic form is itself a compound periphrasis: BE in the compound past in (33a), WANT in the compound past in (33b).

(32) a iaste tâlмăcindu (= (10a))
    be.AUX.3SG interpret.GER
    era scris (= (5a))
    be.AUX.3PL write.PTCP
    era învățându (= (10b))
    be.AUX.3SG teach.GER
    fum veselindu (= (10c))
    be.AUX.1PL be.glad.GER
    fusese văzut (= (5b))
    be.AUX see.PTCP
    fusease purtând (= (10d))
    be.AUX.3PL carry.GER
    fure faptu (= (5d))
    be.AUX.3SG do.PTCP
Note that the WANT auxiliary (inflected for mood and tense or occurring as an analytic form) may be accompanied by a BE auxiliary, occurring as a bare infinitive or as a past participle, thereby giving rise to another variety of double (32i2), (32i4) and even triple (32i3), (33b2), (33b3) compound periphrases.

In contrast to these now defunct forms, all the periphrastic forms which have been preserved are characterized by auxiliaries with a simpler inflexional structure: notably, what is absent from the feature composition of these auxiliaries is a tense specification. Thus, as proposed in Nicolae (2015; 2019) on the basis of older remarks by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), modern Romanian periphrastic structures appear to be oriented around the category of mood, encoded explicitly by the auxiliary verb; tense inflection is not present on the auxiliary. Emergent structures whose auxiliaries have a more complex structure encoding also tense (cf. (32) and (33)) are not diachronically preserved in the standard language.

This claim finds support in the compound auxiliary forms. With the double auxiliary forms preserved in modern Romanian – the conditional perfect and the future perfect (as well as their infrequently used gerundial counterparts, specialized for epistemic values) – we observe that the second auxiliary is the invariable FI ‘be’. The preservation (and vitality) of these forms is extremely relevant for the diachronic process discussed here. First, it is relevant as it confirms the hypothesis that the elimination of a subset of auxiliary-based forms is not driven by reasons
which have to do with auxiliary selection (as one might be tempted to believe, given that many of the defunct forms are based on εἰ ‘be’), since ἔστω is preserved with these forms (as well as with the perfect subjunctive and with the perfect infinitive, see §8.5.2). Nor does it have to do with the disappearance of compound auxiliary forms – these periphrases contain two auxiliaries. Second, observe that this ἔστω (interpreted as an irrealis auxiliary in these modern Romanian forms, see §8.3) occurs as an uninflected form, a form which in and of itself is unspecified for tense. This gives rise to yet another extremely relevant old/modern Romanian difference. Alongside these invariable ἔστω forms (where the auxiliary is syncretic with the bare infinitive), we find in old Romanian forms in which the auxiliary ἔστω occurs as a past participle (fost) (examples 6a, 6c, 6h, 6i, 11a, 11e, 11g, 11i); these past participle ἔστω forms also disappeared, we believe, for a similar reason: as a past participle, ἔστω is inflexionally complex and bears tense features (i.e. [past]), hence the periphrasis diachronically disappeared because it contained a tense-bearing auxiliary, even if ἔστω is not the first auxiliary in the cluster. Below, we briefly address the division of labour in the marking of TAM categories, and we show that in modern Romanian compound auxiliary structures, both auxiliaries encode mood values. However, two more facts should be mentioned before discussing this in more detail.

First, from what has been said so far, it follows that some of the now defunct periphrases were subjected to a bi-directional pressure on their auxiliaries: with forms such as (6i) (= (32i3) above), two of the three auxiliaries in the cluster (the highest, WANT in the imperfect, and the lowest, ἔστω as past participle) explicitly marked tense, hence their loss was motivated on two accounts. Second, we see inflexional simplification at work from at least two other perspectives as well. On the one hand, participle agreement in non-passive structures (see the discussion of examples (7), (8), (9) in §8.2.2 above) disappears from the standard language across the board (Dragomirescu 2014), being preserved only occasionally in dialectal Romanian (see (23), (27)): it disappears both from structures where the ἔστω auxiliary displays inflexion (as a synthetic form (9b) or as an analytic form (8a)), and from structures where ἔστω occurs as an invariable auxiliary (7b), (9b).

On the other hand, we see forms such as the perfect or gerundial subjunctive, which in modern Romanian consists of the subjunctive particle să plus the invariable auxiliary ἔστω plus the past participle/gerund, evolving from structures in which ἔστω is originally inflected for the subjunctive, but gradually undergoes inflexional simplification losing the subjunctive marking and turning into an invariable auxiliary (cf. (34)).

(34) a  să    fīm    noi    iubit    pre    Dumnezeu
SBJV   be.AUX.1PL we   love.PTCP   DOM  God
‘should we have loved God’ (CC1.1567:25')

a'  să  fi  iubit
SBJV   be.AUX love.PTCP  (modern Romanian)

b  pentru  că  să  fi  judecând  la  tot norodul
for  that  SBJV   be.AUX.PL judge.GER  to  all  people.DEF
‘so they might be judging all the people’ (BB.1688:340)

b'  să  fi  judecând
SBJV   be.AUX judge.GER  (modern Romanian)

It is not clear if the disappearance of participle agreement and of subjunctive inflexion is directly related to the type of inflexional simplification which we have taken to explain the disappearance
of a subset of auxiliary-based forms, but it essentially reflects a tendency towards inflexional simplicity operating at a pace with other similar processes.

Returning now to the idea that the now defunct periphrases involved auxiliaries whose feature matrix was more complex than that of auxiliaries found in periphrastic forms which have survived, we briefly bring to the fore some supplementary evidence for the hypothesis that modern Romanian auxiliaries are mood oriented,\(^\text{19}\) and comment on the division of labour between the auxiliary and the lexical verb in the marking of TAM categories.

First, the contrast between the periphrastic paradigms with auxiliary \textsc{have} in (standard) French (35) and (standard) Romanian (36) shows that in French, but not in Romanian, the auxiliary overtly inflects for both tense and mood. By contrast, the Romanian periphrasis with the \textsc{have} auxiliary is unambiguously indicative (and may have the functional value of a past punctual or a present perfect); the tense (and aspect) specification is provided by the morphology of the lexical verb (D’Hulst, Coene & Avram 2004:364):

\begin{align*}
(35) & \quad \text{a) } j’ai \quad \text{mangé} \quad \text{(French)} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{ll}
I=\text{have.AUX.IND.PRS.1SG} & \text{eat.PTCP} \\
\end{array} \\
& \quad \text{b) } j’avais \quad \text{mangé} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{ll}
I=\text{have.AUX.IND.IMPF.1SG} & \text{eat.PTCP} \\
\end{array} \\
& \quad \text{c) } j’aurai \quad \text{mangé} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{ll}
I=\text{have.AUX.FUT.1SG} & \text{eat.PTCP} \\
\end{array} \\
& \quad \text{d) } j’aurais \quad \text{mangé} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{ll}
I=\text{have.AUX.CONJ.PRES.1SG} & \text{eat.PTCP} \\
\end{array}
(36) & \quad \text{eu am mâncat} \quad \text{(Romanian)} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{ll}
I=\text{have.AUX.1SG} & \text{eat.PTCP} \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}

Second, the mood-oriented nature of Romanian auxiliaries can also be illustrated by the ‘opacification’ of the conditional auxiliary, a fact that could be related to the complete loss of its initial temporal value. The Romance conditional, considered as a separate mood or as a tense of indicative (Quer 2016), generally originates in a periphrastic future in the past (Ledgeway 2012:136), and has preserved some of the original temporal values and uses in addition to the novel modal and evidential ones. The Romanian conditional auxiliary most plausibly originates from a past form (an imperfect, probably contaminated by the simple past, Zafiu 2017) of the same auxiliary as the future (\textsc{want}), and probably went through the same process, moving from a future in the past value to the development of modal values. Relics of some temporal values of the \textit{aș}-conditional can still be identified in the sixteenth century, but they rapidly disappear (see §8.2.1 supra). The present-day Romanian conditional-optative has two important features: an opaque auxiliary, whose relation to its etymon and with the future auxiliary is no longer visible\(^\text{20}\), and a value which is no longer temporal, but only modal (Zafiu 2013: 50-3; Vlad 2012).

Third, minimal pairs like the following indicate that the entire periphrastic system of modern Romanian (except for the particle + subjunctive periphrases, see §8.5.2) is organized like this, with the auxiliary/auxiliaries primarily encoding mood values, and the lexical verbs encoding

\(^{19}\) Cross-linguistically, it has been shown that auxiliaries may encode different TAM categories (Anderson 2006): tense, mood or aspect, as well as other linguistic categories. Therefore, the feature matrix of a given auxiliary needs to be identified for each language/structure in turn.

\(^{20}\) The opaque nature of this auxiliary is reflected in the etymological debates which linked the modern forms to another auxiliary, \textsc{avea} ‘have’ (cf. Rosetti 1932:104; Elson 1992).
tense. In (37) the difference between the future and the future perfect is ensured by the distinction between the infinitive (37a) and the “perfect infinitive” (itself made up of irrealis BE plus a past participle, see also fn. 16) (37b), not by the auxiliary voi.

(37) a  Voi cânta.  (future)
   want.AUX.1SG sing.INF
   ‘I will sing.’

b  Voi fi cântat.  (future perfect)
   want.AUX.1SG be.AUX sing.PTCP
   ‘I will have sung.’

This becomes more evident with presumptive and epistemic conditional periphrases: the difference between a past vs a present/future orientation is solely conveyed by the difference between the gerund (present participle) (38a), (39a) and past participle (38b), (39b) encoded by the inflexional make up the lexical verb; the functional sequence which precedes the lexical verb is identical.

(38) a  O fi venind azi / mâine / *ieri?
   PRT be.AUX come.GER today tomorrow yesterday
   ‘Could/Should (s)he be coming today/tomorrow?’

b  O fi venit *mâine / ieri?
   PRT be.AUX come.PTCP tomorrow yesterday
   ‘Could/Should (s)he has come? / Is it possible that (s)he came? / Did (s)he come?’

(39) a  Ar fi venind (non-past)
   AUX.COND.3SG be.AUX come.GER
   ‘(S)he would come / be coming.’

b  Ar fi venit (perfect)
   AUX.COND.3SG be.AUX come.PTCP
   ‘(S)he would have come.’

Finally, it is important to highlight the fact that the presumptive – a set of periphrastic forms which, together with the conditional and the subjunctive, make up the class of irrealis moods – partially grammaticalized in Romanian.21 It cannot be coincidental that a language with mood-oriented auxiliaries grammaticalized a periphrastic form with a primarily mood-oriented usage.

To conclude, the auxiliary system of modern Romanian appears to be mood-oriented, while the extinct auxiliary structures explicitly marked both mood and tense, therefore not conforming to the mood-oriented periphrastic pattern which diachronically prevailed to modern Romanian22.

21 While the presumptive is traditionally claimed to be a so-called Balkan feature that is found in many of the languages of the Balkan area (see Friedman’s 1986 discussion of the Bulgarian, Macedonian and Albanian presumptive), the particular forms discussed here (the so-called Romanian presumptive) are more similar to the Romance epistemic future, both from the point of view of their values, and from the point of view origin (see Squartini 2005).

22 Note that, according to a long line of generative scholarship (see, for example, Cornilescu 2000; Schifano 2018), finite synthetic verb forms systematically raise to the mood head in modern Romanian. Nicolae (in press) develops this hypothesis in more detail.
8.5.2 Diachronically stable analytic formations

Of the forms introduced in §8.3 above, there is a set of diachronically stable analytic forms which might appear problematic for the mood-based explanation proposed in the previous section, but are not, as their internal structure is different from that of auxiliary-based forms.

The colloquial future made up of the particle o + the subjunctive, the colloquial future made up of fully inflecting HAVE + the subjunctive (40a) and the future consisting of the imperfect of HAVE + the subjunctive (40b) are not auxiliary-based forms of the same type as the periphrastic formations discussed above. In contrast to the typical auxiliary-based forms, which are characterized by obligatory clitic climbing and a single negator, with these subjunctive-based periphrases pronominal object clitics remain within the domain of the subjunctive verb (40) and negation may also marginally adjoin to the subjunctive (41); note that Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) and Avram (1999) argue that the HAVE + the subjunctive configuration (40a) is subject to a biclausal analysis.

(40) a  o / am să- l
      PRT   have.PRS.1SG SBJV= CL.ACC.3MSG
asclut.
listen.PRS.SBJV.1SG
‘I will listen to him.’

b  aveam să- l asclut.
     have.IMPF.IND.1SG SBJV= CL.ACC.3MSG listen.SBJV.PRS.1SG
‘I was going to listen to him.’

(41) nu o / am / aveam să
      not PRT have.IND.PRS.1SG have.IND.IMPF.1SG SBJV
      (?nu) asclut.
not listen.SBJV.PRS.1SG
‘I will not listen / I wasn’t going to listen.’

The perfect subjunctive and perfect infinitive (42) are not problematic either, due to the cluster-internal distribution of functional elements. In contrast to auxiliaries, the formatives a and să occur to the left of clitics and the clausal negator and have been analysed as occurring in the complementizer domain (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Alboiu and Motopanyane 2000; Gheorghe 2013; Nicolae 2015:§III). Hence, for these forms, the division of labour in the marking of TAM is shared between the complementizer domain and the inflexional domain; besides the lexical verb, the sole other component internal to the inflexional domain is a mood marker – the invariable auxiliary BE, the exponent of irrealis (just like in the case of perfect conditional, future perfect, and gerundial epistemic periphrases) –, a fact which ensures the diachronic stability of the periphrases.

(42) să / a nu îl fi văzut
     SBJV to not CL.ACC.M.3SG be.AUX see.PTCP
‘(s)he should/to not have seen him’

By contrast, periphrases like the double compound perfect subjunctive become diachronically extinct for the same reason as the group auxiliary-based forms discussed in the previous section: one of their auxiliaries is the past participle form of BE, an overt bearer of tense features.
8.5.3 The relevance of analytic formations which were preserved dialectally
The dialectal data presented in §8.4 appear to challenge our analysis. However, if we pay attention to the details related to the usage of these verbal periphrases, we notice that most of them are very rarely attested or attested in very isolated areas; our analysis has focused on the standard language, therefore the dialectal data do not challenge the analysis, as they are not part of the same variety. The only periphrasis which continues in many areas and has a considerable frequency is the one illustrated in (24), the am fost dat type (44a). The contrast in (44) shows that in this particular periphrasis (44a), the auxiliary AVEA ‘have’ still exclusively expresses mood, the tense-aspect value being expressed by the second part of the structure (fost + past participle).

(44)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>[fost dat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have.AUX.1SG</td>
<td>be.AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give.PTCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>[dat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have.AUX.1SG</td>
<td>give.PTCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.6 Conclusions: the loss of analyticity in a wider perspective
On the basis of the empirical data analysed in the paper, it has been observed that Romanian privileges mood: auxiliaries systematically grammaticalize as exponents of mood, and this has consequences for their internal structure and for the periphrases they are part of. Periphrases with auxiliaries whose feature matrix is richer and also includes tense features fail to enter the periphrastic system of standard Romanian (and, in some cases, give way to functionally equivalent synthetic formations). Anna Giacalone Ramat’s (2000:125) remark that ‘members of the category “auxiliary” exhibit differences in their degree of grammaticalization and are located at different points along the “Verb-to-TAM” chain’ is thus highly relevant in this respect.

Another consequence of our analysis is that, besides the fact that some synthetic formations prevail over functionally equivalent periphrastic formations (whose internal structure does not observe the mood-oriented option), given the mood-oriented nature of the Romanian system, there are values which simply fail to get an exponent; this is the situation of the progressive, gerund-based periphrases, whose sole relics in modern Romanian are the gerundial presumptive and the very limited subjunctive and conditional gerundial periphrases.
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