

II. BRANDS OF CULTURAL IDENTITY

PERSPECTIVES “FROM OUTSIDE” ON THE ROMANIAN LANGUAGE

Cosmin CĂPRIOARĂ
„Ovidius” University of Constanța
ct.caprioara@yahoo.fr

Abstract

The paper aims to analyse how Romanian has been perceived, known and presented by some of the great foreign linguists of the past one hundred years. They are dialectologists, Romance languages’ specialists, grammarians, mostly from the European space, who have known differently Romanian language and approached it in their work.

Key words

Romanian language, foreign linguists, European space, grammarians, dialectologists.

1. Preliminary considerations

This paper aims to continue a series¹ dedicated to how the Romanian language has been perceived, known and presented by scholars, cultural figures and especially by foreign linguists. Some of them encountered the language incidentally or without particular interest, while others, driven by comparative linguistic research concerns, approached it more deliberately. Generally, these are Romanists and Romanianists, most from the European

¹ The series was opened by Cosmin Căprioară’s article, 2023, “Limba română în atenția lingviștilor străini din ultimul secol”, published in Marina Cap-Bun, Florentina Nicolae (coord.), Centrul de Cercetare și Dezvoltare Profesională “Studiile românești în context internațional” (STUR), *Limba, literatura și civilizația română în lume*, București: Editura Universitară, pp. 341-351.

space, but also from America, who have known Romanian in various ways and have accordingly addressed it in their studies.

We can begin our endeavour by referencing the Finnish Valentin Kiparsky's statement (from *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, XLV, 1944, p. 42), according to which the Romanian language is, "linguistically, the most interesting in Europe,"² and the Italian Matteo Bartoli's assertion (from *Saggi di linguistica spaziale*, 1945, p. 139) that "Romanian is the most faithful and at the same time the most unfaithful language in relation to Latin."

The description of the interest in Romanian has been conducted chronologically, but also according to the geographic space to which the authors of various articles, studies, volumes etc. belong. As we have moved closer to the present day and the number of these contributions has become quite large, a selection of the most important or relevant works has been necessary.

2. Studies from the 20th and 21st centuries dedicated to Romanian

If in the 19th century, the emergence and increasingly widespread application of the comparative method, intertwined with the Romantics' interest in spoken languages, made Romanian an unavoidable presence in works of Romance linguistics, in the 20th century, the typology and number of approaches concerning it increased and diversified. The Slavist Franz Miklosich and Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke, who permanently established Romance linguistics, devoted significant attention to the Romanian language at the turn of the century. A prominent Romanist and Romanianist, Gustav Weigand, who traversed the Romanian space in all directions, provided the first detailed studies on the territorial varieties of the Romanian language and a linguistic atlas, *Linguistischer Atlas des dacorumänischen Sprachgebiets* (WLAD), published between 1901 and 1908 under the auspices of the Rumänische Institut in Leipzig.

² Cf. Eugeniu Coșeriu, 2023, *Principalele probleme ale limbii române*. Ediție îngrijită de Cristina Bleorțu, Cristinel Munteanu și Johannes Kabatek, București: Editura Academiei Române, p. 13.

In the 20th century, in the context of achieving national unity, modernising Romanian society and synchronising culturally with the West, interest in the Romanian language naturally grew. All the great Romanists demonstrated a more or less in-depth knowledge of the Romanian linguistic reality. Some, like the Swede Alf Lombard, conducted essential studies on phonetics and morphosyntax (*La prononciation du Roumain, Le verbe roumain, Rumänisk Grammatik* etc.), and the Danes Kristian Sandfeld and Hedvig Olsen wrote about Romanian syntax (*Syntaxe roumaine*, 1936). The Italian Carlo Tagliavini, a fine connoisseur of Romanian, is also part of this series of renowned names. Therefore, his analysis of our language, made in his fundamental work *Le origini delle lingue neolatine* (Bologna, 1949), is very fair and comprehensive. It should not be forgotten that he is also the author of a grammar of the Romanian language (*Grammatica rumena*, 1923) and an anthology (*Antologia rumena*, 1925), both published in Heidelberg, as well as the discoverer of a 17th-century trilingual Latin-Romanian-Hungarian dictionary, *Lexiconul Marsilian*.

3. Grammars, handbooks and special studies of Romanian language and Romance linguistics

We have already reviewed in the opening article of the series (see footnote 1) a selection of the most significant foreign works focusing on the Romanian language. Through this endeavour, we aim to revisit and supplement the list of these works, which, this time, are categorised into grammars and textbooks of Romanian language, handbooks of Romance linguistics and special studies dedicated to certain aspects of our language.

3.1. Grammars and textbooks of the Romanian language

Throughout the 20th century, many foreign scholars wrote Romanian language courses, grammars and textbooks, which we will review in chronological order:

Among the first works of this kind is the one by the American Philip Axelrad, *The Elements of Roumanian: A Complete Roumanian Grammar*

with *Exercises*, published by the Romanian Library, New York, 1919 (reprinted in an anastatic edition in 2014)³.

Next is the Italian Carlo Tagliavini, with *Grammatica della lingua rumena* (on the cover: *Grammatica rumena*) (Heidelberg, 1923), which also has a German variant titled *Rumänische Konversations-Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1938). The grammar, which promotes a didactic method for studying foreign languages that was innovative at the time (“Method Gaspey-Otto-Sauer,” as specified on the frontispiece of the cover), is accompanied by a comprehensive anthology of Romanian texts, *Antologia rumena* (Heidelberg, 1923).

Also from the Romance space, we should also mention the textbook by the Portuguese Fernando V. Peixoto da Fonseca, *Métoda práctico da lingua romena* (Lisbon, 1944), which appeared in a new edition in 1963.

The American interest in Romanian is maintained through W. Irving Crowley, who published *Elements of Romanian. Basic Course* (Pangloss Publ. Hollywood CA) in 1944, and George O. Seiver (from the University of Pennsylvania), who, almost a decade later, proposed an interesting *Introduction to Romanian* (Hafner Publishing Company, New York, 1953).

Alain Guillemmou, a renowned eminescologist and professor at the École Nationale des Langues Orientales Vivantes (now the Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales), a student of Mario Roques and Jean Boutière, published an interesting *Manuel de langue roumaine. Grammaire, textes d'études commentés avec index grammatical et glossaire*, in Paris, in 1953, followed in 1960 by a collection of *Textes d'études en langue roumaine*, to which Al. Niculescu dedicated a review in “Studii și cercetări lingvistice” (SCL), XII, 1961, no. 4, pp. 583-588. The textbook is considered by the reviewer to be “a systematic and detailed description of the grammatical structure of the Romanian language” (p. 583) and, furthermore, “superior to *all* (author’s emphasis) similar works” that had been published

³ For further details, see the conference “Ages and Faces of the Romanian Language in the United States”, held by Mona Momescu at the Romanian Cultural Institute in New York, <https://icr.ro/new-york/varste-si-chipuri-ale-limbii-romane-in-sua/en>.

abroad until that time (p. 588). Guillermou notes that the Romanian language has numerous subtleties (in terms of articles, determination etc.), many stemming from the fact that it is not fully standardised (as a literary variant). Al. Niculescu criticises the author for a certain unfamiliarity with Romanian linguistic research of the period and the small space given to phonetics (about 10 pages) and especially the history of the language (a few lines, “far too elementary, even too imprecise for a general introduction,” pp. 583-584). However, the morphology and syntax of the Romanian language are presented in detail, but differently: if the morphology is described orderly and classified, the syntax is distributed in notes and comments to the 14 texts proposed for exercises and interpretation. It is, therefore, primarily “a practical work of a grammarian,” “a work with well-defined practical purposes.” The comparison is made with other Romance languages, but especially with French. And by highlighting the specific elements, the difficulties of our language are brought to the fore. Sometimes, the author proposes new morphological classifications, not encountered in Romanian grammars until then (in the case of nouns and adjectives). The main sources of information were I. Jordan’s *Gramatica limbii române*, the Candrea-Adamescu dictionary (CADE) and S. Pușcariu and T. A. Naum’s *Îndreptarul și vocabularul ortografic*, all from the interwar period, but no other valuable contributions of Romanian linguistics up to the publication of the book were considered.

Approximately in the same period, the work by Wolfgang Rothe, *Einführung in die historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Rumänischen* [Introduction to the Historical Phonetics and Morphology of Romanian] (Halle, 1957), was printed in the Germanic space.

The Czech Jiří Felix proposes a Romanian language textbook for everyone, *Rumunština pro samouky* [Romanian for Self-Learners] (Prague, 1965).

The German Klaus-Henning Schroeder shows his interest in Romanian in his *Einführung in das Studium des Rumänischen. Sprachwissenschaft und Literaturgeschichte* [Introduction to the Study of Romanian. Linguistics and Literary History], a bibliographic coursebook useful to foreign students (Berlin, 1967).

The conversation guide by the Dane Bagge Ussing, *Rumaensk parlør* [Romanian Conversation Guide] ([no place], 1967) also appeared in the same year.

The first modern presentation of Romanian, made in Russian, is owed to Tamara A. Repina, *Rumynskij jazyk* [Romanian Language] (Moscow, 1968).

A bilingual English-Romanian textbook, *Modern Romanian. Limba română* (Seattle-London, 1971), is the work of the American James (Jim) A. Augerot, written in collaboration with Florin D. Popescu. In 2000, Jim Augerot published one of the most recent editions of this course, titled *Romanian/Limba Română. A Course in Modern Romanian* (The Center for Romanian Studies, Iași-Oxford-Portland), to which Marina Cap-Bun dedicated a small “review,” in an article published in “Analele Universității Ovidius”⁴. She notes the merits of the course, which “includes a complex offer of materials,” the author “aspiring to develop complex conversational skills, from colloquial to literary style, through the acquisition of notions of phonetics, pronunciation, intonation, the formation of a basic vocabulary and the understanding of a few elementary semantic and syntactic structures.” The author states that “the initiative to introduce, at the end of the textbook, special lessons about Ion Creangă (lesson 26), Mihai Eminescu (lesson 30) and Ion Luca Caragiale (lesson 31) is also remarkable.”

The Swedish scholar Alf Lombard is the author of a well-received Romanian coursebook, *La langue roumaine: Une présentation* (Klincksieck, Paris, 1974), which is actually the French translation of the volume *Rumänsk grammatik*⁵ (Lund, 1973). The work was reviewed by Valeriu Rusu in the ‘Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire’, tome 57, issue 4, 1979, pp. 1066-1073⁶. Professor Lombard’s constant interest in Romanian is also explained by his view of our language, succinctly expressed in the words reiterated by V. Rusu: “c’est le quatrième pied de la table de la linguistique romane

⁴ *Limba și cultura în lume. Lectoratul de limba română de la Seattle*, in: “Ovidius University Annals of Philology”, Vol. XIV, 2003, pp. 295-298, accessed 9 September 2023, available at <https://litere.univ.ovidius.ro/Anale/03%20volumul%20XIV%202003/02%20sectiunea%20II%20>.

⁵ See the review (*compte-rendu*) of Andrei Avram, in: *Romania*, 378-379, 1974, tome 95, pp.414-420.

⁶ Available at https://www.persee.fr/doc/rbph_0035-0818_1979_num_57_4_5622_t1_1066_0000_4, accessed 10 September 2023.

comparée” (p. 1066). A dense volume, “un *excellent* (author’s emphasis) manuel de roumain”, “un ouvrage *fondamental* (author’s emphasis) dans ce domaine” (p. 1073), which was supposed to be the first part of a project entitled *Introduction à l’étude du roumain*, followed by a collection of commented texts and a summary of the history of the language. Similar to the volume *La prononciacion du roumain*, Lombard aims to present Bucharest Romanian, a language “which could be called ‘banal’, everyday Romanian, without any particular, distinctive colour, the ‘zero style’” (p. VIII, translator’s note). A section dedicated to the vocabulary, as well as maps or images, are missing; however, the volume is very rich in information and detailed in terms of phonetics and morphosyntax, where naturally, the reviewer’s thorough observations appear, normal in relation to the level at which a non-native linguist can know the subtleties/difficulties of Romanian.

Among the authors of Romanian textbooks there is also the British historian Dennis Deletant, a specialist in post-war Romania issues, who published *Colloquial Romanian* (with two CDs and two cassettes) in 2002, at Routledge in London, in collaboration with R. Gonczol-Davies.

The Belgian Liliane Tasmowski-De Ryck offers an acclaimed *Cours de grammaire roumaine* ((Éditions de la Fondation Culturelle Roumaine, 2001), an enriched reissue of the same work published in Ghent in 1989. In love with Romanian, like Georges Mourin, ‘the father of Belgian Romanianists’ as M. Sala calls him, she established a Romanian language department in Antwerp. Moreover, her intellectual profile and activity as a Romanianist were warmly evoked by M. Sala in an article from the ‘Româna în afara țării’ section in “Limba română”, LVII, 2008, no. 4, pp. 559-561. Alongside Sanda Reinheimer, Liliane Tasmowski published *Pratique des langues romanes: Espagnole, français, italien, portugues, roumain* (L’Harmattan, Paris/Montreal, 1997) and II. *Les pronoms personnels* (L’Harmattan, Paris/Montreal, 2005).

One of the more recent works concerning the Romanian language comes from Spain and belongs to Professor Xavier Lamuela, in collaboration with Virgil Ani, *El romanès: estudi comparatiu entre la gramàtica del català i la del romanès*, written in Catalan (first edition, 2005, second, 2006). It is

an accurate, documented presentation of the contemporary Romanian language (it is known that Virgil Ani taught Italian for a long time at the University of Bucharest), in a constant comparative-contrastive note with Catalan (all areas of the language are reviewed: phonetics and phonology, morphosyntax, vocabulary).

3.2. Handbooks of Romance linguistics

The modern series of works on Romance linguistics begins with Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke's *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* (4 volumes, 1890-1902) and *Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachen* (1901). Later, Meyer-Lübke would constantly refer to the Romanian lexical material in the fundamental *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (REW), published in several editions starting in 1911. He also referred to Romanian in studies included in the first volume of the series initiated by Gustav Gröber *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (1906) and in the article *Rumänisch, Romanisch, Albanesisch*, published in *Mitteilungen des rumänischen Instituts an der Universität Wien* (1914).

Several decades later, Édouard Bourciez followed with his *Éléments de linguistique romane* (Klincksieck, Paris, 1946 [1910]). This posthumous edition was amended by Marius Sala in a review published in SCL, VII, 1956, no. 3-4, pp. 285-294 ("I have tried to correct and complete the facts referring to the Romanian language in the precious handbook of the late Éd. Bourciez"). Due to inadequate documentation (for example, for the grammatical system, Aug. Scriban's *Gramatica limbii românești* was used, and the fundamental works on the South-Danubian Romanian dialects by Th. Capidan and S. Pușcariu are missing from the bibliography), numerous detailed inaccuracies slipped in (for example, the consonant represented by *ge* or *gi* would be a fricative, not an affricate, as it actually is, *ǧ* and *ǧ̃*, considered guttural sounds etc.).

A leading figure in this field is Carlo Tagliavini, the author of the well-known work *Le origini delle lingue neolatine* (Bologna, 1949, Romanian trans., *Originile limbilor neolatine. Introducere în filologia romanică*, EȘE,

1977, based on the sixth edition of the work from 1972). In the “Introduction” to the Romanian translation, Al. Niculescu noted:

“Professor Carlo Tagliavini’s work is the only widely circulated introduction to Romance linguistics and philology in the world that gives the Romanian language a vast space, equal to that of the other Romance languages, abandoning its presentation as a mere comparative term, of general references. (...) Such a perspective on Romanian issues could only come from a Romanist deeply knowledgeable about the Romanian language, as few Romanists are.” (p. V).

Another great Romanist, the Hungarian Benedek Elemér Vidos, published in Dutch, *Handboek tot de Romaanse taalkunde* (Nijmegen, 1956), initially translated into Italian, then into Spanish (*Manual de lingüística románica*, Aguilar, Madrid, 1963), and later into German (*Handbuch der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*, München, 1968).

The British scholar W. D. Elcock is the author of another important handbook of Romance linguistics, *The Romance Languages* (Faber & Faber, New York, 1960). A second revised edition, with an introduction by John A. Green, was printed in London in 1975 by the same publisher. In the *Preface*, Elcock acknowledges how much he owes to Éd. Bourciez and the works of German scholars. He explains that “my requirement was for something in no sense monumental and rather more ‘elementary’ than Bourciez’s conception of elements would allow; yet at the same time more comprehensive in that it would relate the story of how the Latin became Romance more intimately to the whole European saga, to the familiar background of humanistic studies” (p. 8). Some reviewers accused the handbook of being ‘atheoretical’, lacking extensive theoretical considerations. As regards Romanian, Elcock received solid information from Professor G[rigore] Nandriș at the London School of Slavonic and East European Studies, a renowned Slavist who “has been constantly available to answer my queries on Rumanian” (p. 8).

Pierre Bec is credited with the prestigious *Manuel pratique de philologie romane*, a two-volume work (Picard, Paris, 1970-1971), reissued in 2000. Romanian is treated in the second volume: Tome II. *Français, roumain, sarde, rhéto-frioulan, francoprovençal, dalmate. Phonologie.*

Index. Avec la collaboration, pour le roumain, de Octave Nandriș⁷, pour le dalmate, de Žarko Muljačić, Éditions A. & J. Picard, Paris, 1971 (643 pages, *Connaissance des langues*, vol. VI). Marius Sala reviews it in SCL, XXV, 1974, no. 2, pp. 201-204, considering the volume, at that time, “the most recent introduction to Romance linguistics”, achieved, unlike those that had already appeared, through commented texts, which makes it akin to a chrestomathy, but with commentaries that become “short treatises of historical grammar for each language, with numerous and useful references to similar phenomena in other Romance languages” (p. 201). Romanian is grouped together with French, the ‘extreme’ languages of Romania and the lesser-circulated languages. The work concludes with an appendix devoted to a sketch of Romance phonology and one containing a classification of Romance languages, along with indexes of forms and subjects. The texts for each language are accompanied by a typological description in the introduction, with French and Romanian being the most detailed, and in the case of Romanian, “we are even dealing with a short history of the language” (p. 201), spanning 50 pages. This is not surprising, as the 150 pages devoted to Romanian are owed to O. Nandriș. Of these, 15 pages cover the main typological features, while the last 60, containing commentaries on the texts in the form of notes (over 250), represent a true compendium of historical grammar. Thus, P. Bec’s handbook is the first work in Romance linguistics where Romanian occupies such an important place. The four commented texts are: a fragment from the *Palia de la Orăștie*, one from Neculce’s *Chronicle*, M. Eminescu’s poem *La steaua* and a fragment from L. Rebreanu’s *Pădurea spânzuraților*. The main criticism is related to Nandriș’s view that all phenomena distinguishing Romanian from other Romance languages can be explained by substrate influence. However, overall, the work plays a very important role in disseminating knowledge about the Romanian language abroad, as noted by M. Sala.

Romanian could not be absent from Volume I, *External History of the Romance Languages* (American Elsevier Publishing Company, New York,

⁷ Reputable phonetician, author of the valuable *Phonétique historique du roumain*, Klincksieck, Paris, 1963.

1974), of Robert A. Hall Jr.'s comparative grammar, *Comparative Romance Grammar*. In fact, this is the 'prolegomena' to a six-volume work that deals with the phonology, morphology, syntax, word formation and lexicon of Romance languages. The author's documentation, as an Italo-Romance specialist, is extensive, with references spanning no less than 80 pages. Chapter Two deals with the Romance languages and their distribution. Special attention is also given to the superstratum languages in the Romance space.

British Romanists Martin Harris and Nigel Vincent coordinated a comprehensive work on Romance studies, *The Romance Languages*, published by Routledge (London, 1988). Romanian is presented by Graham Mallinson in Chapter 11 (pp. 380-419). The author specifically refers to Daco-Romanian and Aromanian, two of the four variants of "Balkan Romance." The presentation is generally accurate and well-documented. However, with regard to the plural forms (such as *pomi* 'trees'), the author considers them to be palatalised consonants, adopting the theory of E. Petrovici, and in the subsection on *Multiple-clause Sentences* (p. 411), examples are given with the verb *a fura* 'to steal': *Ion a furat cartea și Radu a furat carnetul* ('Ion stole the book and Radu stole the notebook'), which is reduced to: *Ion a furat cartea și Radu carnetul* ('Ion stole the book and Radu the notebook'), compared with *Radu a plecat de acasă și a furat mașina* ('Radu left home and stole the car')! We believe that numerous other illustrative examples could have been found!

In *The Romance Languages* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), Rebecca Posner duly presents various aspects of the Romanian language. Sometimes, her views differ from those of most Romanists, such as when she refers to the recent character of the passive construction with the auxiliary *a fi* 'to be', which she believes imitates the model of Western Romance languages ("it is late" and literary), and the antiquity of the passive with *se*. Gabriela Pană Dindelegan responds to this in *Elemente de gramatică. Dificultăți, controversate, noi interpretări* (Bucharest, Humanitas Educațional, 2003, Chapter 9 *Note asupra pasivului* 'Notes on the Passive', pp. 133-141). According to her conclusions, the passive with the auxiliary "is an *old* (author's emphasis) realisation of the passive, having the same history and

being characterised by the same continuity as in other Romance languages” (p. 138). The only concession G. Pană Dindelegan makes to R. Posner refers to the increasing importance of the passive with auxiliary over time, which, in the “literary-cultivated” register of the contemporary language, is much more frequent than the reflexive-passive. This increase in importance can also be attributed to an external cause in the current literary language, especially since in the folk and colloquial register the “frequency ratio” favours the passive with *se*.

Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin and Christian Schmitt are the editors of a comprehensive *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* (LRL), in 8 volumes (Max Niemeyer Verlag, Berlin, New York/Tübingen, 1988-2005), a veritable Romance encyclopaedia. Volume three (Band III), *Die einzelnen romanischen Sprachen und Sprachgebiete von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart: Rumänisch, Dalmatisch/Istroromanisch, Friaulisch, Ladinisch, Bündnerromanisch*, 1989, deals with Romanian. The subsections *Anthroponimy* (pp. 358-380) and *Toponymy* (pp. 381-404) concerning Romanian are signed by Lidia Sfirlea.

Gerhardt Ernst, Martin-Dietrich Glessgen, Christian Schmitt and Wolfgang Schweickard coordinated another fundamental working tool for Romanists, *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/ L’histoire linguistique de la Romania* (RSG), subtitled *Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen/ Manuel international d’histoire linguistique de la Romania*, Vols. 1-3 (Walter De Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 2003-2006).

Martin-Dietrich Glessgen, professor in Zurich and Paris, president of the Society for Romance Linguistics, publishes one of the most complex and comprehensive handbooks of Romance linguistics [*Linguistique romane. Domaines et méthodes en linguistique française et romane*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2007 (2012), in Romanian translation by Professor Alexandru Gafton: *Lingvistică romanică. Domenii și metode în lingvistica franceză și romanică*, Polirom, Iași, 2014]. For some observations about this valuable work and how the Romanian language is viewed, see our review from 5 October 2015, published in the electronic journal “Diacronia” (www.diacronia.ro).

Professors Ti Alkire and Carol Rosen from Cornell University in New York are the authors of a historical introduction to the field of Romance languages: *Romance Languages. A Historical Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2010), which also has an online version as of 2012. Chapter 10 is dedicated to Romanian: “History and structure of Romanian: an overview” (pp. 252-286). Only Portuguese receives the same attention in the preceding chapter. The work contains a useful “Glossary of linguistic terms” and interesting “Suggestions for further reading”.

British professors Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith and Adam Ledgeway have written one of the most recent and well-conceived histories of the Romance languages, *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* (CambrHist), consisting of two volumes: I. *Structures*, II. *Contexts* (Cambridge/New York, 2010-2013).

In fact, Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden are also the authors of a very interesting guide in the Romanic field, *The Oxford Guide of the Romance Languages* (Oxford University Press, 2016), to which researchers from the “Iorgu Jordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy have contributed as well.

Furthermore, Adam Ledgeway, an Italianist and Romanist, offers new perspectives on the morphosyntax of Romance languages in his work *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change* (Oxford University Press, 2015 [2012], translated into Romanian as *De la latină la limbile române: Schimbare morfosintactică și tipologică*, Univers Enciclopedic, Bucharest, 2017).

Lorenzo Renzi (from the University of Padua) and Andreose Alvise (from the University of Udine) are the authors of an extensive and well-documented *Manuale di linguistica e filologia romanza* (Il Mulino, Bologna, 2003). A new edition (Bologna, 2015) provides a comprehensive and up-to-date panorama of the Romance languages. For Old Romanian, the text selected for commentary is Coresi’s *Tetraevangelium*.

In the Iberian space, José Enríque Gargallo Gil and Maria Reina Bastardas coordinate an extensive *Manual de lingüística romanica* (Editorial Ariel, Barcelona, 2007). This handbook is specifically intended for a Hispanic

audience, modelled after the LRL and RSG works created by German-speaking authors. It features contributions from prominent Romanists such as Antoni M. Badia i Margarit, Martin-Dietrich Glessgen, Michael Metzeltin, André Thibault, Pere J. Quetglas, Johannes Krammer, Dan Munteanu Colán and others. Romanian receives equal treatment alongside other Romance languages, with Professor Gargallo Gil himself being a proficient Romanian speaker. The external history of Romania is intertwined with its internal history. The evolution of languages, early texts, codification of national and regional languages and descriptions of Romance linguistic systems - all come together. For our language, subchapters of interest include “*Latinus en rumano*” (52), “*Romanus en rumano*” (58), “**Romaniscus y ‘Romanisce en rumano*” (60, author: J. Krammer), “*Primeros textos en rumano*” (115, Ana Cano), “*La codification del rumano*” (178, M. Metzeltin), “*Los casos en rumano*” (256, Germá Colón Doménech), “*La doble adscription tipológica del rumano*” (422, M. Metzeltin) and “*Situación lingüística del rumano*” (507), with special reference to Aromanian and the situation in the Republic of Moldova (author: Francisco Fernández Rei).

3.3. Special studies

The following does not concern the majority of articles and studies dedicated specifically to Romanian in the last century, which, as expected, are quite large in number. A selection has been made among the more comprehensive studies that had a significant impact in their time.

Firstly, the work of the Danes Kristian Sandfeld and Hedvig Olsen, *Syntaxe roumaine. Emploi des mots à flexion* (vol. I, E. Droz, Paris, 1936) is worth mentioning. The work was posthumously continued, based on the authors’ manuscript, by linguist Holger Sten, through the publication of the last two volumes: vol. II. *Les groupes de mots*, 1960; vol. III. *Structure de la proposition*, 1962 (Librairie Manksgaard, Copenhagen). The second volume was the subject of a review by Mioara Avram (in SCL, XII, 1961, no. 4, pp. 588-594), in which the author notes elements that were described differently from Romanian linguists, and the fact that the work was outdated at that time, unlike the first volume.

The Soviet linguist Ruben A. Budagov, who generally had a balanced attitude in discussions about the so-called “Moldovan language”⁸, focused on Romanian syntax in *Etjudy po sintaksisu rumynskogo jazyka* [Studies on the Syntax of the Romanian Language] (Moscow, 1958).

Giuliano Bonfante, in *Studi romeni* (Rome, 1973, translated into Romanian as *Studii române*, Saeculum I.O., Bucharest, 2001), addresses a wide range of topics concerning the history of the Romanian language. The volume includes articles organised in four sections: I. *The pre-Roman element in Romanian* (rhotacism, the origin of Romanian and Albanian etc.), II. *The Latin element in Romanian* (the Latinity of Romanian, its place among the Romance languages, the postposed article, the future tense etc.), III. *Romanian civilisation and language* (Hellenism in Dacian Latin, vocabulary and civilisation etc.), IV. *Testimonies on the Romanian language* (Dante’s name for the Danube, knowledge of Romanian in Europe etc.).

In *La prononciation du Roumain* (Uppsala, 1935), Alf Lombard, a friend and proficient speaker of Romanian, presents to the foreign public a study conducted after only a month spent in Bucharest, focusing on a single speaker, considered a characteristic representative of the Bucharest speech specific to the younger generation from cultivated classes, without any vulgar, regional or archaic tinge (see the generally laudatory review by G. Ivaşcu, in BIFR, 1935, Vol. II, p. 257-261).

Alf Lombard is also responsible for one of the first comprehensive studies dedicated to the Romanian verb, *Le verbe roumain. Étude morphologique* (Lund, 1955; 1223 pages; initially published in two

⁸ He maintained, as much as it was possible during that period, an objective stance on this issue, particularly asserted in his works *Introducere în ştiinţa limbii* [Introduction to the Science of Language], 1958 (Romanian translation, 1961) and *Problemele studierii limbilor literare romănice* [Problems of Studying the Romance Literary Languages], 1961 (Romanian translation, 1962). See Gh. Mihăilă, *În marginile adevărului* (II): *Prof. R. A. Budagov despre unitatea şi specificul limbii române între limbile romănice*, in: “Limba română”, XI, 2001, no. 9-12, Chişinău, accessed on 11 September 2023, available at: <https://www.limbaromana.md/index.php?go=articole&n=2929>.

volumes, the first in 1954). A very rigorous review was made by Mioara Avram, published in SCL, VII, 1956, no. 1-2, and in an abridged version in “Revue de linguistique”, I, 1956, pp. 137-145. The author notes that this is the first extensive study on the Romanian verb, the Swedish professor, a good connoisseur of Romanian and a reputable phonetician, using information provided by the *Atlasul lingvistic român* ‘Romanian Linguistic Atlas’, as well as special surveys conducted by him with native Romanian speakers. The main merit of the work, in Mioara Avram’s opinion, lies in highlighting the live, productive categories, such as verbs with the infinitive in *-a* and with the present tense stressed on the suffix, and the paths of development of verbal inflection in Romanian. Lombard is among the first to identify six classes of verbs, not four as was traditionally done. The author not only consults dictionaries and specialised works but also verifies, as far as possible, their sources. Criticisms include those related to the method-induced repetition of the same information about the subdivisions of the six identified verb classes and the lack of indexes of subjects and affixes, which might have aided in the clarity of the exposition. Also considered bizarre is the categorisation as autochthonous of words inherited from Latin, while those due to the substrate are included among borrowings. The (then) newly published *Gramatică a limbii române* (EA, 1954) could only be consulted during proofreading.

From Belgium, Marleen Van Peteghem proposes a study of Romance syntax, *Les phrases copulatives dans les langues romanes* (Gent, 1991), which also discusses the situation in the Romanian language.

A separate category consists of fundamental works carried out by renowned Romanian researchers in collaboration with foreign linguists. Collaborations with Professor Martin Maiden from Great Britain are at the forefront. Here we can mention the work *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*, published by M. Maiden, Adina Dragomirescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Oana Uță, and Rodica Zafiu at Oxford University Press, in 2021, a valuable contribution to diachronic linguistics.

4. Conclusions

In conclusion, it can be said that in the last century, the Romanian language has consistently enjoyed interest from foreign linguists and has been, in general, accurately perceived and characterised. We have set aside the allegations from Soviet linguistics, especially during the Stalinist period, when some theories dictated by ideology were launched regarding the Romanian language. Against the backdrop of theoretical discussions about the relationship between language and dialect, the idea was promoted that the South-Danubian Romanian dialects would represent separate Romance languages in relation to Daco-Romanian, which could lead to the justification of promoting the existence of the “Moldovan language.”⁹

It should be pointed out, however, that if gaps or interpretative issues have arisen, many of them are particularly due to the fact that several of the fundamental descriptive works of our language, written by Romanian specialists, were not yet finalised (such as the thesaurus, the treatise on the history of the language etc.) or had not been translated into an international language (an issue that is beginning to be corrected, for example, through the publication of the English version of the *Gramatica de bază a limbii române, The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, 2013, and many other works published abroad or in a widely spoken language, such as *Comparative and Diachronic Studies on Romance Syntax*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018, authored by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula, Alexandru Nicolae (ed.)).

Naturally, the observations or opinions of the authors reflect the level of their documentation and, more precisely, the Romanian or foreign sources from which they drew their information. Therefore, some theories that were widespread in Romanian linguistics, such as the one regarding the palatalisation correlation in the field of consonants, belonging to E. Petrovici (the ending of *pomi* would not be a final

⁹ See the ‘response’ given, years later, by prominent Romanian linguists, during the proceedings of the scientific session organised by the Philology and Literature Section of the Romanian Academy on 31 October 1994, in the brochure *Limba română și varietățile ei locale*, EAR, București, 1995.

asyllabic *i*, but a palatal *m*, for example), were adopted by Romanists such as the British M. Harris and N. Vincent.

The Romanian language is being given the place it deserves, especially recently, in works of Romance studies and beyond, which is due not only to the richness of the Romanian linguistic material from all fields, but also to the fact that there are increasingly more Romanists who are also Romanianists and who are very familiar with our language.

Bibliography

1. Sources (in chronological order)

1.1. Grammars, monographs and academic treatises

BOURCIEZ, Édouard, 1946, *Elements de linguistique romane*, Paris: Klincksieck.

MEYER-LÜBKE, Wilhelm, 1890-1902, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 4 volume.

MEYER-LÜBKE, Wilhelm, 1901, *Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachen*.

SANDFELD, Kristian; OLSEN, Hedvig, 1936, *Syntaxe roumaine*. I. *Emploi des mots à flexion*, Paris: E. Droz.

TAGLIAVINI, Carlo, 1923, *Grammatica rumena*, Heidelberg.

TAGLIAVINI, Carlo, 1949, *Le origini delle lingue neolatine*, Bolonia (traducere românească, *Originile limbilor neolatine. Introducere în filologia romanică*, Versiune românească îngrijită și coordonată de Alexandru Niculescu, Traducere Anca Giurescu, Mihaela Cârstea-Romașcanu, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1977).

1.2. Handbooks and studies of Romanian and Romance languages

ALKIRE, Ti; ROSEN, Carol, 2010, *Romance Languages. A Historical Introduction*, Cambridge University Press.

BEC, Pierre, 1970-1971, *Manuel pratique de philologie romane*, Vol. I-II, (reeditare 2000), Paris: Picard,.

BONFANTE, Giuliano, 1973, *Studi romeni*, Roma.

DELETANT, Dennis; GONCZOL-DAVIES, R., 2002, *Colloquial Romanian* (cu două CD-uri și 2 casete), Londra: Routledge.

ERNST, Gerhardt; GLESSGEN, Martin-Dietrich; SCHMITT, Christian; SCHWEICKARD, Wolfgang (ed.), 2003-2006, *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/ L'histoire linguistique de la Romania* (RSG), subintitulată *Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen/ Manuel international d'histoire linguistique de la Romania*, Vol. 1-3, Berlin/New York: Walter De Gruyter,.

GARGALLO GIL, José Enrique; BASTARDAS, Maria Reina (coords), 2007, *Manual de lingüística romanica*, Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.

GLESSGEN, Martin-Dietrich, 2007, *Linguistique romane. Domaines et méthodes en linguistique française et romane*, Paris: Armand Colin, ediția a doua, 2012 (traducere românească, *Lingvistică romanică. Domenii și metode în lingvistica franceză și romanică*. Cuvînt înainte și traducere de Alexandru Gafton, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2014).

GULLERMOU, Alain, 1953, *Manuel de langue roumaine. Grammaire, textes d'études commentés avec index grammatical et glossaire*, Paris: Klincksieck.

HARRIS, Martin; VINCENT, Nigel (ed.), 1988, *The Romance Languages*, Londra: Routledge.

HOLTUS, Günter; METZELTIN, Michael; SCHMITT, Christian (ed.), 1988-2005, *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* (LRL), 8 volume, Berlin, New York/Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

LAMUELA, Xavier, 2005, *El romanès: estudi comparatiu entre la gramàtica del català i la del romanès*, a doua ediție, 2006, Barcelona.

LEDGEWAY, Adam, *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford University Press, 2015 [2012], trad. rom. *De la latină la limbile romanice. Schimbare morfosintactică și tipologică*, Univers Enciclopedic, București, 2017.

LEDGEWAY, Adam; MAIDEN, Martin, 2016, *The Oxford Guide of the Romance Languages*, Oxford University Press.

LOMBARD, Alf, 1974, *Le verbe roumain, La langue roumaine. Une présentation*, Paris: Klincksieck.

MAIDEN, Martin; DRAGOMIRESCU, Adina; PANĂ DINDELEGAM, Gabriela; UȚĂ, Oana; ZAFIU, Rodica, 2021, *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*, Oxford University Press.

MAIDEN, Martin; SMITH, John Charles; LEDGEWAY, Adam, *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, Vol. 1. *Structures*, 2010, Vol. 2. *Contexts*, 2013, Cambridge.

PANĂ DINDELEGAN, Gabriela; DRAGOMIRESCU, Adina; NICULA, Irina; NICOLAE, Alexandru (ed.), 2018, *Comparative and Diachronic Studies on Romance Syntax*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

POSNER, Rebecca, 1996, *The Romance Languages*, Cambridge University Press.

RENZI, Lorenzo; ALVISE, Andreose, 2003, *Manuale di linguistica e filologia romanza*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

SEIVER, George O., 1953, *Introduction to Romanian*, New York: Hefner.

VIDOS, Benedek Elemér, 1956, *Handboek tot de Romaanse taalkunde*, Nijmegen.

2. Scientific references

ARMBRUSTER, Adolf, 1972, *Romanitatea românilor. Istoria unei idei*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

AVRAM, A., 1973, Compte-rendu: Alf Lombard, *Rumänsk grammatik*, Lund, în *Romania*, 378-379, 1974, tome 95, pp. 414-420.

AVRAM, Mioara, 1955, Compte-rendu: ALF LOMBARD, *Le verbe roumain. Etude morphologique*, Lund, 8°, XIV + 1223 p., in « *Revue de linguistique* », Tome 1, 1956, pp. 137-145 (Texte abrégé du compte rendu paru dans « *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* », Bucarest, VII, 1956, n° 1-2).

CAP-BUN, Marina, 2003, *Limba și cultura în lume. Lectoratul de limba română de la Seattle*, in “*Ovidius University Annals of Philology*”, Vol. XIV, Constanța, pp. 295-298.

CĂPRIOARĂ, C., 2016, Recenzie: “*Martin-Dietrich Glessgen, Lingvistică romanică. Domenii și metode în lingvistica franceză și romanică*”, in: *Diacronia* (www.diacronia.ro), 3/12 februarie 2016, A43 (p. 1-7), Iași: Editura Revista “*Diacronia*”.

COSERIU, E., 1994 [1980], *Limba română în fața Occidentului, de la Genebrardus la Hervás. Contribuții la istoria cunoașterii limbii române în Europa occidentală*. În românește de Andrei A. Avram, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia. (E. Coseriu, 1980, *Von Genebrardus bis Hervás. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kenntnis des Rumänischen in Westeuropa*, Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag).

COȘERIU, E., 2023, *Principalele probleme ale limbii române*. Ediție îngrijită de Cristina Bleorțu, Cristinel Munteanu și Johannes Kabatek, București: EAR.

IORDAN, I., 1962, *Lingvistică romanică. Evoluție. Curente. Metode*. Ediția a II-a, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române.

IVAȘCU, G., Recenzie: Alf Lombard, *La prononciation du roumain*, Uppsala 1935. 73 pp. in 8°, in “Buletinul Institutului de Filologie Română” (BIFR), 1935, Vol. II, pp. 257-261.

MIHĂILĂ, Gh., 2001, *În marginile adevărului (II): Prof. R. A. Budagov despre unitatea și specificul limbii române între limbile romanice*, in “Limba română”, XI, nr. 9-12, Chișinău, available at <https://www.limbaromana.md/index.php?go=articole&n=2929>.

NICULESCU, Al., Recenzie la Alain GUILLERMOU, *Manuel de langue roumaine. Grammaire, textes d'études commentées avec index grammatical et glossaire*, Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1953, 286 p., in “Studii și cercetări lingvistice”, XII, 1961, nr. 4, București, pp. 583-588.

RUSU, V.; LOMBARD, Alf, 1979, *La langue roumaine. Une présentation*, în « Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire », tome 57, fasc. 4, Histoire (depuis l'Antiquité) – Geschiedenis (sedert de Oudheid), pp. 1066-1073.

SALA, M., „Recenzie” la Pierre BEC, *Manuel pratique de philologie romane*, tome II. *Français, roumain, sarde, rhéto-frioulan, francoprovençal, dalmate. Phonologie. Index*. Avec la collaboration, pour le roumain, de Octave Nandris, pour le dalmate, de Žarko Muljacic, Paris, Editions A. & J. Picard, 1971, 643 p. + 14 hărți (= *Connaissance des langues*, vol. VI), în „Studii și cercetări lingvistice”, XXV, 1974, nr. 2, pp. 201-204.

SALA, M., 1956, *Limba română în „Éléments de linguistique romane” de Éd. Bourciez*, in “Studii și cercetări lingvistice”, VII, nr. 3-4, București, pp. 285-294.

SALA, M., 1978, *Liliane Tasmowski*, in “Limba română”, LVII, nr. 4, pp. 559-561.