

The Status of the Conjunctive Mood in Romanian Linguistic Literature

Andreea-Carmen Zaicu

This research represents a part of our PhD thesis, titled *Conjunctive - a Proposal for a Reanalysis from a Comparative Romance Perspective*, and aims to briefly describe the evolutionary trajectory of the conjunctive in Romanian. Starting with its status and the way of defining its morphosyntactic functioning and its semantic values in the first grammars of the Romanian language, it takes into account its relations with other verbal moods (infinitive/indicative/conditional). Since its use in Latin, but also in the various periods of development of the Romance languages, the conjunctive appears, to a greater or lesser extent, as a subordinating mood. The multitude of nuances and meaning effects obtained, depending on the instance of communication and the speaker's intentions, represents one of the great problems of its analysis and interpretation in linguistic literature in general, and implicitly, in Romanian linguistic literature as well.

Conjunctive mood; verbal form; morphosyntactic value; semantic value; verbal paradigm.

1. Introduction

Referring to the evolution of Romanian linguistics, we have noted that in the grammars and literature review published until 1914, there was no attempt to create a Romanian grammar on a scientific basis, since the theses issued in that period on Romanian grammar did not consider the grammatical structure of the language to be of major importance. We have also noticed that in the Romanian linguistic past, not all the grammars presented much scientific thoroughness, however, the exception were those edited by I. Heliade Rădulescu (1828) and H. Tiktin (1945). Although they differed in value due to the content that each of them dealt with, these books managed to adopt a progressive concept of the evolution of Romanian grammar.

The first grammars of the Romanian language were based on erroneous reasoning, taken from Latin or from the west Romance languages, with the aim of integrating this reasoning into Romanian grammar. Even if, most of the times, the linguistic research activity of the most prominent Romanian linguists has been contested in many situations, in our opinion, they have contributed considerably to the development of Romanian linguistics through their research. In the following lines, we will review some of the grammars issued

between the 18th century and the 20th century, in order to highlight the evolutionary process of the Romanian conjunctive mood, as it was received by Romanian linguists.

2. *Gramatica rumânească* - Dimitrie Eustatievici Brașoveanul, 1757

In 1757, the first grammar of the Romanian language titled *Gramatica rumânească* – Romanian Grammar – was published by Dimitrie Eustatievici Brașoveanul. Taking Molnar's Latin grammar as a model, the author closely followed the Latin text, taking over certain elements of the work's structure and, at the same time, the method of the subject matter organized in the form of questions and answers (Brașoveanul, 1969, pp. XVIII, XXII).

However, Dimitrie Eustatievici takes a further step in order to include the peculiarities of the Romanian language in certain rules and commentaries. (Brașoveanul, 1969: XXII) Starting with the introductory study, the author draws particular attention to the conjunctive mood, pointing out that this mood has as distinctive sign the particle *cînd* – *cînd săvîrșesc*, *cînd săvîrșam*, *cînd am săvîrșit*, *cînd voi săvîrși* – these forms also being explained by the influence of Latin grammar taken as a model (Brașoveanul, 1969, p. XXIV).

Concerning the terminology used by Eustatievich in naming the verbal time, he opts for the form *vreme* (instead of *timp*): *Ce este vremea? Este prin care să arată orice grai precum este acum săvîrșitori, sau demult, sau fiitori* (Brașoveanul, 1969, p.50). Therefore, he emphasizes the existence of five times - *vremile graiurilor* - the verbal times in the dialects (Brașoveanul, 1969, p. 50), such as:

- *vremea cea de acum* - present tense, "which refers to a present deed or feeling" - *dovedesc, mă dovedesc*;
- *vremea cea trecută nesăvîrșită* – imperfect tense - "which shows that the deed has not been accomplished" - *dovedeam, mă dovedeam*;
- *vremea cea săvîrșită* – past tense - "it shows that the deed was accomplished in the past" - *am dovedit, dovedit am fost*;
- *vremea cea săvîrșită demult trecută* - past perfect tense - "which shows that the deed or feeling had been accomplished a long time ago" - *dovedisem, dovedit fusesem*;
- *vremea cea fiitoare* – future tense - "which signifies the deed to be done" - *voi dovedi, mă voi dovedi* (Brașoveanul 1969, p.50).

As for the verbal moods and tenses, which he calls by the terms *închipuire* and *împărtășire*, using a structural calque, Dimitrie Eustatievich divides them as follows: *închipuirea cea arătătoare* – indicative mood, *închipuirea cea poruncitoare* – imperative mood, *închipuirea cea poftitoare* – conditional mood, *închipuirea cea încheietoare* - conjunctive mood, *închipuirea cea nehotărătoare* – conjunctive mood, *împărtășirea vremii cei de acum* – present indicative tenses, *împărtășirea vremii cei trecute* - past indicative tenses, *împărtășirea vremii cei fiitoare* – future indicative tenses.

With regard to the conjunctive mood – *închipuirea cea încheietoare*, whose distinctive sign is the conjunction *când*, we note the following analysis/classification of verb forms:

- *vreamea cea de acum* – present tense: *cînd săvîrșesc, -ești, -aște / cînd săvîrșim, -și, -esc., cînd mă săvîrșesc, te, să săvîrșeș / cînd ne săvîrșim, vă, să săvîrșesc;*

- *vreamea cea nesăvîrșită* – imperfect tense: *cînd săvîrșam, -ai, -a / cînd săvîrșeam, -a, -a. cînd mă săvîrșam, te, să săvîrșea / cînd ne săvîrșam, vă, să săvîrșea;*

- *vreamea cea săvîrșită* – past tense: *cînd am săvîrșit, ai, au / cînd am săvîrșit, ați, au / cînd m-am, te-ai, s-au săvîrșit / cînd ne-am, v-ați, s-au săvîrșit, or cînd ași fi săvîrșit, ai fi, ar fi / cînd am fi săvîrșit, ați fi, ar fi / cînd sînt, or am fost, ești sor ai fost, este or au fost săvîrșit, -tă, -t / cînd sîntem or am fost, sînteți or ați fost, sînt or au fost săvîrșit, -te, -te.*

- *vreamea cea demult săvîrșită* – past perfect tense: *cînd săvîrșisem, -eși, -e / cînd săvîrșisem, -eți, -e / cînd mă săvîrșisem, te, să săvîrșise / cînd ne săvîrșisem, vă, să săvîrșise or cînd eram or fusesem, erai or fusesese, era or fusesese săvîrșit, -tă, -t;*

- *vreamea cea fiitoare* – future tense: *cînd voi săvîrși, vei, va / cînd vom săvîrși, veți, vor cînd mă voi săvîrși, te vei, să va / cînd ne vom săvîrși, vă veți, să vor or cînd aș săvîrși, ai, ar / cînd am săvîrși, ați, ar / cînd m-aș săvîrși, te-ai, s-ar / cînd ne-am săvîrși, v-ați, s-ar (Brașoveanu, 1969, pp. 52-53).*

- *vreamea cea de acum* – present tense: *cînd ajut, ajută, ajută / cînd ajutam, ajutați, ajut or -tă / cînd mă ajut, te, să ajută / cînd ne ajutam, vă, să ajut sau-tă;*

- *vreamea cea nesăvîrșită* – imperfect tense: *cînd ajutam, -ai, -a / cînd ajutam, -ați, -a / cînd mă ajutam, te, să ajuta / cînd ne ajutam, vă, să ajuta;*

- *vreamea cea săvîrșită* – past tense: *cînd am ajutat, ai, au / cînd am ajutat, ați, au / cînd m-am ajutat, te-ai, s-au ajutat / cînd ne-am ajutat, v-ați, s-au ajutat or cînd aș fi, ai fi, ar fi ajutat / cînd am fi, ați fi, ar fi ajutat / cînd ajutat, -tă, -t, sunt or am fost or cînd m-aș fi ajutat;*

- *vreamea cea demult săvîrșită* – past perfect tense: *cînd ajutasem, -eși, -e / cînd ajutasem, -eți, -e / cînd mă ajutasem, te, să ajutase / cînd ne ajutasem, vă, să ajutase or cînd eram or fusesem ajutat, -tă, -t;*

- *vreamea cea fiitoare* – future tense: *cînd voi ajuta, vei, va / cînd vom ajuta, veți, vor / cînd mă voi ajuta, te vei, să va ajuta / cînd ne vom ajuta, vă veți, să vor ajuta or cînd aș ajuta, ai, ar / cînd am ajuta, ați, ar / cînd m-aș ajuta, te-ai, s-ar ajuta / cînd ne-am ajuta, v-ați, s-ar ajuta (Brașoveanu, 1969, p.60).*

It is noticeable that this analysis starts from syntactic functioning and not from morphological forms. In addition, *închipuirea cea încheietoare* – the conjunctive mood - is also called subjunctive, receiving the forms *deaca, de, de, de vreme ce* in place of the particle *cînd* (Brașoveanu, 1969, p.64).

Therefore, we note the association of this verbal form with the distinctive particle *cînd*, a particle different from the currently spoken language. At the same time, the conjunctive mood, called *închipuirea cea încheietoare* by Eustatievici Brașoveanu, has all the tenses that we find in the indicative mood – *închipuirea cea arătătoare*. It should also

be noted that the author gives the reflexive variants for each temporal form, although there is some confusion between the conjunctive and the conditional moods.

3. *Elementa linguae daco-romanae sive valachicae* - Samuil Micu and Gheorghe Șincai, 1780

Samuil Micu's *Elementa linguae daco-romanae sive valachicae*, the first grammar of the Romanian language, written in the Daco-Romanian language, was published in Vienna in 1780, with Gheorghe Șincai's collaboration. The work was part of the demands of the representatives of the Transylvanian School to obtain social and political rights for Romanians, equal to those of the three recognized political nations of Transylvania (Micu, Șincai, 1980, p.V).

In this sense, Ursu (1971, p.260) argues in *Modelul gramaticii lui Samuil Micu și Gheorghe Șincai* that Micu and Șincai had as a model the work of Georgio Nagy, namely, *Elementa linguae germanicae...ex optimis autoribus collecta*, published in Vienna in 1775, written by order of Maria Theresa, for the German language for pupils and students in Hungary and Transylvania (Micu, Șincai, 1980, p.XIII).

Elementa linguae daco-romanae sive valachicae was published in two editions, the first one in 1780, written by Samuil Micu and revised and completed by Gheorghe Șincai, and the second one in 1805, with Gheorghe Șincai as author, and was reedited in 1980 by the Romanian Academy.

As far as the presentation of morphology is concerned, the authors used Latin grammar as a model, trying to find Romanian corresponding forms to each Latin category. Moreover, in addition to the classification found in previous grammars, the conditional is categorized under the conjunctive, a form specific to Latin grammars (Micu, Șincai, 1980, p.XIII). An important aspect is also the creation of forms that do not exist in Romanian for non-personal moods, for example: *fiitor* - which will be = future participle (Micu, Șincai, 1980, p.XIII).

In this respect, we note that an important aspect of the two editions is the increasingly evident approximation of the paradigm of the Romanian verb to that of the Latin verb, preserving the Latin grammar's moods and tenses with their specific terminology. Thus, for the forms that define the past tense, the term *praeteritum* is used, accompanied by various determiners, such as: *praeteritum imperfectum* - imperfect; *perfectum* – past; *absolutum* – simple perfect; *plusquamperfectum* – analytic past perfect (eu am fost lăudat); *plusquamperfectum absolutum* – synthetic past perfect (Micu, Șincai, 1980, p. XVII). Likewise, the optative, whose tenses are present and perfect, is framed in the conjunctive mood (imperfect and past perfect) (Micu, Șincai, 1980, p.XVII). The perfect of the conjunctive mood is distinguished by its old form: *să fiu* (*să fii, să fie*) *lăudat*.

As regards the conjunctive mood, we note the following analysis of the characteristic verb forms of both the first and the second edition of *Elementa linguae daco-romanae sive valachicae*:

- the present tense is identical with the future of the imperative: *să laud eu / să lauz-i tu / să laud-e el / să lăud-ăm noi, laudemusnos / să lăud-ați voi / să laud-e ei*;
- the perfect tense: *să fiu lăudat / să fi lăudat / să fie lăudat / să fim lăudat / să fiți lăudat / să fie lăudat* (Micu, Șincai, 1980, pp. 49-51).

4. Gramatica românească pentru îndreptarea tinerilor - Constantin Diaconovici Loga, 1822

In contrast to his predecessors, Constantin Diaconovici Loga, in his *Gramatica românească pentru îndreptarea tinerilor* – Romanian Grammar for the Instruction of the Young – first published in 1822 in Buda and re-edited in 1973, inventories five types of verbal moods, as follows: *arățătoriu* (indicative), *demîndătoriu* (imperative), *împreunătoriu* (conjunctive), *poftitoriu* (optative) and *nehotărârîtoriu* (infinitive). Diaconovici Loga (1973, p.16) distinguishes a type of past tense, called past tense I – *eu m-am fost lăudat* – (Diaconovici Loga 1973, p.16) within the verb tenses of the indicative, which represents an old periphrastic form of the past perfect, and in the conjunctive mood an imperfect constructed with *a voi* (*eu să mă vream mira, el să vrea fi*) (Diaconovici Loga, 1973, p.16).

The author also mentions a past tense – *pluscvamperfect* – constructed from the perfect conjunctive of *a fi* and the participle of the conjugating verb: *eu să fiu fost avut* (Diaconovici Loga, 1973, p.16). It is noticeable that in the perfect conjunctive and in the *pluscvamperfect*, the auxiliary has the same form as in the Banat dialects: *eu să fiu fost, el să fie fost, noi să fi fost; eu să fiu fost avut, noi să fi fost avut* (Diaconovici Loga, 1973, p.16).

As for the tenses, Diaconovici Loga claims the existence of six verb tenses: *timpul de acum* or present tense, *timpul nesevârșit* – imperfect tense, *timpul trecut simplu* – past simple tense, *timpul trecut adăugat* – past perfect tense, *timpul mai de mult trecut I-iu* or *pluscvamperfect I* tense, *timpul mai de mult trecut al II-lea* or *pluscvamperfect II* tense, *timpul viitoriu* or future tense (Diaconovici Loga, 1973, p.92).

Regarding the naming of the conjunctive mood, Diaconovici Loga opts for the term *conjunctorial*, referring to its function as a mood of subordination than rather to its modal values in its own right. He thus presents the following analysis of verb forms:

- *timpul de acum* or Present tense - *eu să laud / eu să văd; tu să lauzi / tu să vezi; el, ia să laude / el, ia să vadă; noi să lăudăm / noi să vedem; voi să lăudați / voi să vedeți; ei, ele să laude / ei, ele să vadă*;

- *timpul cel nesevârșit* or Imperfect tense - *eu să vream lăuda / eu să vream vedea; tu să vrei lăuda / tu să vrei vedea; el, ia să vrea lăuda / el, ia să vrea vedea; noi să vream lăuda / noi să vream vedea; voi să vreați lăuda / voi să vreați vedea; ei, ele să vrea lăuda / ei, ele să vrea vedea*;

- *timpul trecut* or Past Simple tense - *eu să fiu lăudat / eu să fiu văzut; tu să fi lăudat / tu să fi văzut; el, ia să fie lăudat / el, ia să fie văzut; noi să fim lăudat / noi să fim văzut; voi să fiți lăudat / voi să fiți văzut; ei, ele să fie lăudat / ei, ele să fie văzut.*

- *Timpul mai mult ca trecut* or Plusquamperfect tense - *eu să fiu fost lăudat / eu să fiu fost văzut; tu să fi fost lăudat / tu să fi fost văzut; el, ia să fie fost lăudat / el, ia să fie fost văzut; noi să fim fost lăudat / noi să fim fost văzut; voi să fiți fost lăudat / voi să fiți fost văzut; ei, ele să fie fost lăudat / ei, ele să fie fost văzut.*

- *Timpul viitoriu* or Future tense - *de voi lăuda eu / de voi vedea eu; de vei lăuda tu / de vei vedea tu; de va lăuda el, ia / de va vedea el, ia; de vom lăuda noi / de vom vedea noi; de veți lăuda voi / de veți vedea voi; de va lăuda ei, ele / de va vedea ei, ele* (Diaconovici Loga 1973, pp. 106-108).

Thus, the Romanian Grammar, published by Constantin Diaconovici Loga in 1822, was influenced, like all grammars of the time, by both the Latinist current and the popular grammar. In this respect, a representative example is the grammar of the western part of the country, where one can observe a constant in the text of the grammar: the periphrastic conjunctive with *a vrea* (*el să vrea veni*), the perfect conjunctive with the auxiliary being differentiated according to persons and number (*eu să fiu venit*) (Diaconovici Loga, 1973, p.19)

5. *Gramateca limbei române. Partea I – Analitica* (1869), *Partea a II-a – Sintetica* (1877) - Timotei Cipariu

In order to have a better organization of the subject matter, Timotei Cipariu opts for the treatment from simple to complex and divides his grammar *Gramateca limbei române* – Romanian Grammar – into two large parts: **Part I – Analitica** or *resolutiva*, in which the author investigates in detail the meaning of words, their variation and special forms, terms still in use or out of use, terms that pertain to the field of the history of the modern or ancient Romanian language, and **Part II – Sintetica** or *constructiva*, in which Cipariu provides explanations of the methods and rules according to which the construction of words took place. In this part, the author also presents in a precise and complete manner the purpose of speech, the particularities of communication between speaker and listener and the fundamental features of the Romanian language.

Thus, it can be seen in the first part, *Analitica*, that there are two main moods, namely: *finitu* and *nefinitu* – *modus finitus et infinitivus* – definite and indefinite moods (Cipariu, 1869, p.269). While the *modus infinitivus* is one, the *modus finitus*, according to the Latin language norm, is divided into four other moods, such as: *indicativu* (indicative), *imperativu* (imperative), *conjunctivu* (conjunctive) and *optativu* (conditional) (Cipariu, 1869, p.269).

As for the classification of tenses, Cipariu distinguishes three main tenses: *presente* – present (*io laudu - acumu*), *preteritu* – past (*laudai - mai in a-ante*) and *future* – future (*voliu lauda - deci in a-ante*) (Cipariu, 1869, p.269). The same author emphasizes three other secondary tenses: for past, two tenses are noted, such as *neperfectu* (*praeteritum imperfectum - io laudam*) – imperfect and *preaperfectu* (*praeteritum plusquamperfectum - laudasem*) – past perfect, and for future, one form is identified, that is merged with *preteritu* (*futurum praeteritomixtum - voliu fi laudatu*), not with passive meaning, but active (Cipariu 1869, p.270). Unlike the *preteritu enepfectu* and *preaperfectu*, the *preteritu principale* tense form is called *preteritu perfectu* (Cipariu, 1869, p.270).

We also note that, according to the author, the Romanian finite moods, except for the indicative, have fewer forms as compared to the Latin ones. If in Latin we find the existence of some forms that are particularly related to the use of the conjunctive mood, in Romanian these forms belong only to the indicative mood, for example: for *io laudasem* in Romanian, the *preteritu preaperfectu* of the indicative is used, while in Latin, *ego laudassem* uses the *plusquam perfectum* of the conjunctive or optative (Cipariu, 1869, p.272).

The *connective* or *conjunctive* mood, the variant for which Timotei Cipariu also opted – as the terminology had been also used by his predecessor, Constantin Diaconovici Loga – has three tenses: *present* - present, *imperfect* or *optativu*– imperfect or optative and *perfectu* or *condiționatu* – perfect of conditional, the last mood also succeeding in replacing the optative (Cipariu, 1869, p.302). Thus, the author offers the following categorization of verb forms:

- Present Tense: *se laudu / laudi / laude / se laudamu / laudati / laude*;
- Imperfect or Optative Tense: *laudare-asi / laudare-ari / laudare-are / laudare-amu / laudare-ati / laudare-arui*;
- Perfect or Conditional Tense: *se lauda-rem / lauda-resi / lauda-re / lauda-remu / lauda-reti / lauda-re* (Cipariu, 1869, pp.302-303).

With regard to the present conjunctive, the same mood of formation as the present indicative can be observed and it is conjugated in all persons in an identical way, except for the third person: *lauda* – present indicative, *laude* – present conjunctive; *bate* – present indicative, *bata* – present conjunctive, where the change of the final vowel can be observed (when in the indicative the verb appears with the final vowel in *-a*, in the conjunctive it will change to the final vowel *-e* and *vice versa*) (Cipariu, 1869, p.303).

As for the imperfect tense and the optative, it should be noted that they are formed from the whole infinitive in *-re*, with the final *asi* form: *laudare-asi*; on the other hand, the infinitive form in *-re* is eliminated if another pronominal particle is placed between the infinitive and the ending, as shown in the example: *lauda-te-asi* (Cipariu, 1869, p.303).

In addition, it is worth noting the tenses *perfectulu* and *condiționatu*, tenses which are no longer in use. The Macedonian-Romanians are the ones who still use these forms, with slight differences in conjugation, for example: *si furim io, furi tu, furi elu; furimu noi, furitu voi, furi eli*, while in our language they use: *se furem io, furesi tu, fure elu; se furemu*,

furetu, fure correspondent of the Latin variants *fuerim, fueris* (Cipariu, 1869, p.304). At the same time, the conditional tense is also used with the conjunction *se* (Latin form *si*) or *de - se faci tu asia, te asi lauda*, i.e. *de ai face sau deca ai face* (Cipariu, 1869, p.304).

The imperfect indicative is also used in place of the conditional tense, with the specific conjunction *de: de laudam io*, having the same meaning with *de asi fi laudatu io* (Cipariu, 1869, p.304).

As for the formative particle *se*, it cannot be absent from the present and perfect conjunctive: *se laudu, se laudarem*, except for the third person of the present conjunctive, the meaning of which is imperative or optative: *duca-se!* (Cipariu, 1869, p.305). This particle has its origin from *sim, sis, sit*, Latin forms, which come from the older variants of the terms: *fac-sis* and *faxim, faxis, faxit*, that is, *se faci* (Cipariu, 1869, p.305).

According to the second part, *Sintetica*, Timotei Cipariu offers explanations about verbs that encounter certain modifications, regardless of the class of origin. These modifications are called by the author modifiers, referring to verbal moods or *modure*, terminology for which the author himself opts (Cipariu, 1877, p.195). Thus, Cipariu makes a distinction between verbal moods, classifying them into two general parts: finite moods (for certain purposes), such as the indicative – *spre a arata* / to show, the optative – *pentru doriri* / for wishes, the conjunctive – *pentru unele particule împreunătorie* / for some conjunctive particles, the imperative – *cu scop mandatoriu* / with a mandatory purpose, and the infinitive (for undefined purposes) (Cipariu, 1877, pp.195-196).

With regard to the terminology used by the author in naming this tense, he offers the variant of temporal modifiers, in which verbs are divided into distinct forms, according to the time (*tempure*) in which the action is placed, namely: *prezente, trecutu (praeteritu)* and *venitoriu (futurum)*, of which some are subdivided into *perfectu, neperfectu* and *preaperfectu* (Cipariu, 1877, p.196).

In this second part of the grammar, the conjunctive mood is defined by Timotei Cipariu as a mood without a real meaning, but only formal, being intended, as the name - *conjunctivo* - suggests, for certain conjunctions or conjunctive particles (Cipariu, 1877, p.231).

We note that in Romanian, an important aspect of this mood is the specific particle *se*, a mark without which the conjunctive tenses cannot be constructed. Complementary to this mark are also the particles *ca* and *pentru ca*, but they can never function without the morpheme particle *se*, for example: *am venit se ti spunu; ca seti spunu* or *pentru ca seti spunu* (Cipariu, 1877, p.231). Similar to the particles *ca* and *pentru ca*, the variants *câtu* and *in câtu* can also be used, having the same meaning: *l'abatutu, câtu se nusi mai ulite* (Cipariu, 1877, p.234). As for the negative form, it follows the same criterion: *se nu, ca nu cumva se, se nu cumva se – vedi, se nu uliti; iau mutatu faci'a, ca se nu se cunosca / ca nu cumva selu cunosca; se nu faci cumuva, se nu veni; fa se nu cumu-va se asteptamu multu dupa tene* (Cipariu, 1877, p.234).

In addition, the conjunctive is found after active verbs: *scrie se venia; am se me duc; cereși se ve de; roga-lu se venia*, where the second sentence takes the place of the accusative of the verbs in the first sentence: *scrie, am, cereși, roga* or when the objective sentence that realizes the conjunctive is transformed into the infinitive: *am ame duce; cereși, a vise da; roga-lu a veni* (Cipariu, 1877, p.232).

As for the neuter verbs, the conjunctive is used, either when it indicates the purpose, or with the conjunctive particles *ca* and *pentru ca* or it has value on its own, as it is evident from the examples: *ven'o se mergemu; dormu se me repausezu or ven'o ca se mergemu; dormu, pentru ca se me repauseu* (Cipariu, 1877, p.232). At the same time, the conjunctive can also be used with active verbs, these being used, as in the previous examples, to designate the purpose: *scrie se venia; roga-lu se venia* (Cipariu, 1877, p.232). The conjunctive mood takes the place of the accusative in the sentence and designates, at the same time, the purpose of the action; therefore, these can also be constructed with the complementary particles *ca* and *pentru ca*: *scrie ca se venia; rogu-lu pentru ca se venia* (Cipariu, 1877, p.232).

It can be noted, among the aspects mentioned by Timotei Cipariu, that this mood has a restricted number of tenses, namely, one present tense and two preterite with *se fiu* and *se fiu fostu*, these being also used in conditional sentences, the only difference from the indicative lies in the third person form, which is the same for both singular and plural (Cipariu, 1877, p.232).

One important aspect to mention here is represented by the first and second person forms, which cannot do without the representative particle *se*, as the same forms of the indicative could not be distinguished from the same forms of the subjunctive: *facu, faci* (indicative); *se facu, se faci* (conjunctive) (Cipariu, 1877, p.233). However, the third person may lack the morpheme particle *se* because it has a different ending from that of the indicative: *se faca* or *faca* - conjunctive; *face* (singular), *facu* (plural) - indicative (Cipariu, 1877, p.233). Moreover, some grammarians consider this particularity of the third person form, where the particle *se* is missing, as an imperative form and not a conjunctive one (Cipariu, 1877, p.233).

The author also offers explanations regarding the use of the conjunctive tenses, as they have the same form in conditional mood. For example, the particle *se* takes the place of the conditional *se*, as it was in Latin: *se aiba elu bani, bene iaru prende; se fimu avutu noi dereptate, nu ne pierce amu legea* (Cipariu, 1877, p.233). At the same time, instead of the tenses of the conjunctive mood, the optative can also be used: *nu sciu, cene se venia sau ce-near' veni; cene se fia scrisu sauce-ne ar' fi scrisu* (Cipariu, 1877, p.234).

As we have argued above, Cipariu reinforces the idea that the conjunctive uses both the present tense: *voliu se sciu*, but also the other two preterite: *nu e adeveratu, se fia venit; nu se pote, se fia fostu dusu* (Cipariu, 1877, p.233).

We note that another important aspect in the interpretation of the conjunctive mood is given by Greek and Latin grammarians who classify this mood into several types,

depending on the form that the verb has, such as: concessive, hortative (*indemnatoriu*) – *fia reu, fia bunu, totu un'aeste, lasu se fia; totu omulu se se cunosca pre sene, se cade ca totu omulu* (Cipariu, 1877, p.234).

Therefore, the uses of the conjunctive in Greek and Latin are different from the uses of the Romanian conjunctive, the tenses of this mood being developed in a distinct form as opposed to the Romanian variants, the conjunctive particles having a much larger number, for example, in Latin, besides *ut*, they also use *quod, quum, quin*, while the Greeks do not distinguish between *ca* (lat. *ut*) and *ca* (lat. *quod*) (Cipariu, 1877, p.234).

Therefore, the Romanian syntax does not follow the Latin or the Greek model in the uses of the conjunctive. To sustain this, without specifying all the types of verbs and conjunctions that require this mood, it is sufficient to note the aforementioned differences between active and neuter verbs and also to note the conjunctive that indicates the purpose, particularities to which all the uses of the conjunctive in Romanian are reduced.

6. *Gramatica românească*, Ion Heliade Rădulescu, 1828

In 1980, the Romanian Grammar written by Ion Heliade Rădulescu was republished, the first edition being published in 1828. In this book, the author laid down a series of orthoepic and orthographic, morphological and syntactic rules.

An important aspect that he dealt with in his work is the fact that the verb is of several types or moods (Rădulescu, 1980, p.155), by which we often decide or show something e.g. *cum scriu am-vorbi*, *voi cunoaște*; some other times we command e.g. *vezi, înțelege*, some other times we express a wish e.g. *aș umbla, aș fi mers*, in other cases, it expresses an affirmative sentence introduced by another verb, e.g.: *a poruncit ca să împliniți*, and other times it expresses a meaning that shows or contains in itself all the occurrences e.g. *a-face, a-scri*. (Rădulescu, 1980, p.155)

Therefore, Heliade Rădulescu records five verbal moods: *otărîtor, arătător* / indicative – it indicates that a thing is, was or will be, such as *scriu, am scris, voi scri*; *poruncitor* / imperative – it indicates a command or a prayer to do something, such as *scrie tu, dă Doamne; poftitor, îndoitor, condițional* / conditional – it indicates that a thing would be or would have been, such as: *aș scri, aș fi citit; suppus* / subjunctive – it is subject to another verb, such as *a poruncit ca să se facă* and *infinitival, nehotărîtor* / infinitive – it shows the state of a verb, such as *a-scri, a-vorbi, a-cînta* (Rădulescu, 1980, p.155).

The author also claims the existence of three verb tenses, past, present and future. Concerning the past tense, Heliade Rădulescu mentions that this tense is classified into four types: *nesăvîrșit* / unfinished - *scriam* - it shows that the deed has not been finished; *săvîrșit* / finished - *scrisei* - it shows the deed done; *mai-mult-de-cît-săvîrșit (peste săvîrșit)* / past perfect - *scrisesem* - it shows the thing done in the past; *nehotărît* / undecided - *am scrisu* - it shows the thing done without indicating when (Rădulescu, 1980, p.153).

At the same time, the future tense is classified into: *viitoru-întîiu* / future I – *voiu scri*; *viitoru al doilea* / future II - *voiu fi scris* (Rădulescu, 1980, p.153).

With regard to the *suppus* mood (today's conjunctive), we observe the following analysis of verb forms:

- present tense: *ca să cînt-u* / *ca să cînt-i* / *ca să cînt-e* / *ca să cînt-ămu* / *ca să cînt-ați* / *ca să cînt-e*;

- past tense: *ca să fiu-cîntatu* / *ca să fii-cîntatu* / *ca să fi-cîntatu* / *ca să fimu-cîntatu* / *ca să fiu-cîntatu* / *ca să fi-cîntatu* (Rădulescu, 1980, p.179).

An important aspect in the present and past of the *suppus* mood is to be noted, namely, the present of this mood is a simple tense, while its past is a compound tense. We observe, therefore, the division in two tenses (Rădulescu, 1980, p.263), present and past, of the *suppus* mood. The present shows an action which is realized now (Rădulescu, 1980, p.263), but which is approaching the future: *trebuie un stăpînitor să fie nemîtit ca însuși dreptatea* (Rădulescu, 1980, p.263), while the past shows a past action, but also in relation to another sentence (Rădulescu, 1980, p.263): *trebuie să fi-fost bine învățați strămoși noștri, cînd ei aduna așa bibliotecă, a căror astăzi avem numai rămășițele* (Rădulescu, 1980, p.263).

Another important aspect of the past, in addition to the one mentioned above, is its future nuance: *A venit vremea în care să se-cunoască Rumîni ai căror strenepoși sînt. Nu crez să fi venit* (Rădulescu, 1980, p.263). Therefore, the preference for *Nu crez să fi venit*, in stead of *Nu crez că va-fi-venit* is noticeable (Rădulescu, 1980, p.263).

7. Gramatica română - Etimologia și sintaxa - Hariton Tiktin, 1945

In 1945, *Gramatica română - Etimologia și sintaxa* / the Romanian Grammar - Etymology and Syntax was published. Authored by Hariton Tiktin, a German-born personality, it analyzes all the particularities of Romanian grammar and succeeds in laying the most solid foundation on which Romanian philology is based today.

Thus, Hariton Tiktin records four verbal moods: the indicative (*fac*), the conjunctive, which he also calls the subjunctive (*să fac*), the conditional - optative (*aș face*) and the imperative (*fă!*) (Tiktin, 1945, p.95).

As for the verb tenses, the author emphasizes the existence of three main tenses: the present tense, the past tense and the future tense (Tiktin, 1945, p.94). As for the past tense axis, it provides for four tenses: the imperfect, the simple perfect, the compound perfect and the past perfect (Tiktin, 1945, p.94). The future tense axis, according to the author, consists of two tenses, as follows: the future (proper or future I) and the past future (future II) (Tiktin, 1945, p. 94).

As for the conjunctive, Hariton Tiktin characterizes this mood as presupposed, possible, desired (Tiktin, 1945, p.95). In this regard, the author gives the following examples: *Nu cred să fi spus el adevărul.* / *Se poate să faci asemenea lucru?* / *L-am poftit să vie.* / *Facă-se voia ta* (Tiktin 1945: 95). The preference for the particle *să* before the verb

form is noticeable, only the third person can be used without this mark, when it is placed at the beginning of the sentence, for example: *Facă ce-o vrea!* or *Să facă ce-o vrea!* (Tiktin, 1945, p.103).

However, among the forms of the Latin conjunctive, Hariton Tiktin took into account the fact that, in the case of certain verbs, only the third person form has been preserved: *jure, tacă, ducă, doarmă*, from lat. *juret jurent, tacat tacant* (instead of *taceat taceant*), *ducat ducant, dormiat dormiant*, the other forms giving place to those in the indicative, taking by contrast the particle *sa* (lat. *si*) in front of them (Tiktin, 1945, p.105).

Another important aspect can be observed in the expression of the imperative, in the first and third person, where the present conjunctive form is used: *Să vie Ioan numaidecât! – Să nu se amestece în trebile altora! – Să fugim!* (Tiktin, 1945, p.114).

Thus, Tiktin is among the first ones to consider that Romanian conjunctive mood possesses three tenses. The present conjunctive, therefore, is formed from the particle *să* and the participle of the conjugating verb (*să fugim*). As for the perfect conjunctive, it is formed from the particle *să*, the auxiliary *a fi* and the participle: *să fi jurat, să fi tăcut* (Tiktin, 1945, p.118). Also, the auxiliary *fi* is invariable, the forms *eu să fiu jurat, tu să fii tăcut, el să fie făcut* being less used today (Tiktin, 1945, p.118).

According to Hariton Tiktin, the conjunctive of the past perfect is formed from the particle *să*, the auxiliaries *fi fost* and the participle: *să fi fost jurat, să fi fost tăcut* or *jurat să fi fost, tăcut să fi fost* (Tiktin, 1945, p.118).

Moreover, Tiktin shows that in addition to the uses outlined above, the conjunctive mood also helps to form the future tense, more precisely, a way of expressing future predominantly in colloquial speech, which is composed of the auxiliary *o* (shortened from *va*) and the present conjunctive: *o să jur / o să juri / o să jure / o să jurăm / o să jurați / o să jure sau o să tac / o să taci / o să tacă / o să tăcem / o să tăceți / o să tacă* (Tiktin, 1945, p.119). At the same time, in the Moldavian area, the future is formed from the present tense of the verb *a avea* and the present conjunctive: *am să jur / ai să juri / are să jure / avem să jurăm / aveți să jurați / au să jure sau am să tac / ai să taci / are să tacă / avem să tăcem / aveți să tăceți / au să tacă* (Tiktin, 1945, p.119). Therefore, *am să fac ceva* can have two meanings, such as: *voi face ceva* or *am de făcut ceva*, where the auxiliary *voi* represents the present indicative of the vulgar Latin verb *volere* for *velle*, which means *to will*: *voi* from *volo voru voriu* (Tiktin, 1945, p.119).

Regarding the reflexive conjugation, we note the following analysis of verb forms:

- Present Conjunctive: *să mă mir / să te miri / să se mire / să ne mirăm / să vă mirați / să se mire*;
- Perfect Compound Conjunctive: *să mă fi mirat / să te fi mirat / să se fi mirat / să ne fi mirat / să vă fi mirat / să se fi mirat*;
- Past Perfect Conjunctive: *să mă fi fost mirat / să te fi fost mirat / să se fi fost mirat / să ne fi fost mirat / să vă fi fost mirat / să se fi fost mirat* (Tiktin, 1945, pp.124-125).

By wishing to have the most efficient organization of this verbal paradigm, H. Tiktin opts for emphasizing an impressive spectrum of modal values, the great difficulty of analyzing and interpreting the conjunctive mood deriving from the multitude of nuances and meaning effects obtained depending on the context.

Therefore, the conjunctive indicates the required behavior / *arată lucrarea cea cerută*, that is why it is used in commands, exhortations, advice (Tiktin, 1945, p.165): *Să te întorci numaidecât!; Să fugim!; Copiii să asculte de vorbele părinților.; Să-l chemăm încoace?; Ce să-ți mai spui?; De unde săia bietul om mijloacele spre a se hrăni?; Nu știu: să mă duc? Sănu mă duc?* (Tiktin, 1945, p.165).

This verbal paradigm can also express a wish: *Trăiască toți cei ce ne vor binele!; Să vă fie de bine!; Arză-l focul cel de veci!* (Tiktin, 1945, p.165), but also a concession: *Nu vrea să vie în casă? Ei bine, (să) rămâie afară!; Facă-se voia ta, Doamne!* (Tiktin, 1945, p.165).

In addition, in interrogative sentences, the conjunctive often expresses puzzlement or wonder: *Să fi venit oare?; Adevărat să fie?; Să mă crează el capabil de așa faptă?; De unde să vie expresia aceasta?* (Tiktin, 1945, p.165).

In his grammar, Tiktin emphasizes the competition between the conjunctive and the conditional, which alternate: *Arză-te focul, pădure, / Ș'ai cădea sub o secure!* or they occur together in a pleonastic way: *Mânca-l-ar ciorile să-l mănânce!* (Tiktin, 1945, p.166). In this case, unlike the conjunctive, the conditional emphasizes the questioner's puzzlement (Tiktin, 1945, p.166).

Another representative example in this sense is highlighted in folk poetry where we find a rather interesting nuance, a form created from the conjunction of the conjunctive with the conditional: *Oltule, pe malul tău / Crească-ar iarbă și dudău* (Tiktin, 1945, p.166); *Dormi tu, bărbățelul meu, / Ierte-mi-te-ar D-zeu* (Tiktin, 1945, p.166).

However, Tiktin points out that in many cases it is left to the speaker's choice to express a preference for one of the two moods. For example, in the lines: *Puișorul mi-au sburat, / Și cu lacrimi m'au lăsat... - Cum aș face ca să-l prind?* or *Nu știu: turmele lua-le-aș / Ori chimirile zmunci-le-aș?*, the meaning would be the same even if the conditional were replaced by the conjunctive (Tiktin, 1945, p.166).

As one can see, Hariton Tiktin's grammar is very close to current grammar, as conjunctive has the same morphemes and values as those we find in the normative grammars of the current Romanian language.

8. Conclusions

As for the conjunctive terminology, it varies from one grammar to another, depending on the mood followed and/or the functioning of this verbal paradigm.

For example, in Diaconovici Loga, as well as in Heliade Rădulescu, the term *Împreunători*, respectively *Suppus*, refers to the functioning of the conjunctive as a mood

of subordination, the closest to the particularities of the conjunctive mood, specific to current grammars being Hariton Tiktin.

Taking into account all the aspects presented above, we can conclude that the model followed by all grammars was the Latin one, the forms and values of the conjunctive mood being the same as those of the present language. We also found the existence of an interference among moods, in the sense that the same mood can express, depending on the given situation, several nuances of meaning. The same notion can be expressed by several moods, for example, order can be expressed by the imperative, present conjunctive or present infinitive; condition can be expressed by the conditional, conjunctive or indicative with the use of the conjunction *dacă*; probability or membership can be expressed by the conjunctive, presumptive or indicative when preceded by the adverb *parcă* etc.

References

- Braşoveanu, Eustatievici Dimitrie (1969). *Gramatica românească - Prima gramatică a limbii române*. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică.
- Cipariu, Timotei (1869). *Gramateca limbei române*. Partea I – *Analitica*. Bucureşti: Editura Societăţii Academice Române.
- Cipariu, Timotei (1877). *Gramateca limbei române*. Partea a II-a – *Sintetica*. Bucureşti: Editura Societăţii Academice Române.
- Diaconovici Loga, Constantin (1822). *Gramatica românească pentru îndreptarea tinerilor*, editată în anul 1973. Timişoara: Editura Facla.
- Heliade Rădulescu, Ion (1980). *Gramatica românească*. Bucureşti: Editura Eminescu.
- Molnar, Gregorius (1556). *Gramatica latină*. Reeditată în anul 1830. Cluj: Tiparniţa G.Heltai din Cluj.
- Micu, Samuil, Gheorghe Şincai (1980). *Elementa linguae daco-romanae sive valachicae*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.
- Nagy, Georgio (1775). *Elementa linguae germanicae...ex optimis autoribus collecta*, Viena.
- Tiktin, Hariton (1945). *Gramatica română - Etimologia şi sintaxa*. Bucureşti: Editura Tempo.
- Ursu, N. A. (1971). *Modelul gramaticii lui Samuil Micu şi Gheorghe Şincai*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Andreea Carmen Zaicu is a PhD student at the Faculty of Letters from the University of Craiova. Her main area of study is represented by Romance linguistics, applied linguistics, language teaching.(andreeacarmenzaicu@gmail.com)