Camelia Firica
Spiru Haret University, Craiova
Romania

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMANIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE – PHONETICAL AND PHONOLOGICAL ASPECTS

SUMMARY

The beginning of the Romanian literary language can be traced back to the 16th century, the period when the oldest literary Romanian texts known so far were dated.

The dialectal basis of the Romanian literary language is a rather debated issue, since the specialists in the field have formulated several divergent opinions. Some support the idea that the Wallachian dialect lies at the basis of the Romanian Literary Language, some take into consideration the contribution of all Daco-Romanian varieties, while others support the theory that until the end of the 19th century one cannot speak about a unitary literary language, but about several literary variants, each based on the corresponding regional Daco-Romanian sub-dialect.

The process of the unification of the Romanian literary variants started after 1780, when the first printed grammar appeared, and continued through the 19th century with the efforts of the most prominent Romanian scholars. In their endeavour to standardize the modern literary language, those scholars conformed to the criteria invoked by Petru Maior and Heliade Rădulescu: Latin, grammar, geographical distribution, and euphonic criteria; it was the Wallachian literary variant which satisfied these criteria, especially the phonetic ones. Other literary variants also contributed to the formation and improvement of the language structure, especially in morphology and vocabulary.

During the process of its evolution, Romanian has undergone several phonetic, phonological, morphological, and lexical changes. The paper deals with phonetic and phonological characteristics and the evolution of the Romanian literary language from the first printed texts up to the modern period.

Key words: phonetics, phonology, language history, literary text, the Romanian language

A frequently discussed issue among linguistic researchers is the moulding process of a literary language moulding. *By literary language we mean a unique, supradialectal language that comes into being as a reaction against the territorial diversification of a language and ends by becoming the language of the whole population, eliminating dialects* (Ghetie, 1975:43, translated by the author).

According to current opinion of contemporary linguists, a literary language is formed on the basis of a dialect which, due to favourable political or cultural reasons, prevails over other dialects. It imposes itself in writing and is accepted as unique by the speakers of all varieties of the national language. A literary language is not identical to the dialect upon which it is moulded, because it has to reject all the peculiarities of that dialect and assimilate phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical characteristics of the other dialects. The question of the dialectal basis of the Romanian literary language is rather complicated, since there are several divergent opinions, some of which we consider necessary to be summarized.

The opinion that the literary Romanian language is based on the Wallachian vernacular was first formulated by Bogdan Petriceicu Haşdeu. His argument began with the observation that, of all old printed texts, the Wallachian ones, despite their archaic style, are written in a language that is structurally similar to modern Romanian. Haşdeu's claim is that the language spoken in Wallachia imposed itself as the foundation of the cultivated Romanian language. Alexandru Rosetti, Ovid Densuşianu, Alexandru Graur, Ion Coteanu, Boris Cazacu, and some representatives of the Bucharest School of Linguistics also support Haşdeu's theory.

Another group of researchers and historians, however, unanimously agree that the first manifestations of literary Romanian are to be found in the texts that were printed in the northern Romanian region of Maramureş. These scholars argue that the vernacular spoken in this region formed the basis of the literary language.

According to Alexandru Philippide, Iorgu Iordan, Garabet Ibraileanu, and others, all Daco-Romanian varieties contributed to the formation of Romanian. They claim that the dialects did not differ greatly before 1800, and that it was not until after 1859 – when Moldavia and Wallachia united and Bucharest became the capital as well as the cultural and political centre of the country – that the sub-dialect of Wallachia prevailed over those of Moldavia and even Transylvania.

Some linguists, such as G. Ivănescu and Ion Ghetie, support the theory that until the end of the nineteenth century one cannot speak about a unified literary language, but about several literary variants, each of them based on the corresponding regional Daco-Romanian sub-dialect. When the two unifications of these literary variants took place, a spontaneous, partial one noticeable in the printed texts of the eighteenth century century, and another one that occurred in the second half of the nineteenth century, they were both based upon the

Wallachian variant with considerable contributions from the other literary Romanian variants.

G. Ivănescu asserts that *there seems to have existed only two main variants in the oldest literary language: a northern one, belonging to Transylvania, Moldavia, Banat and a southern one, belonging to Wallachia and Oltenia and that it was not until the eighteenth century, when popular elements began to appear in written language, that one could notice four distinctly different dialects: Wallachian, Moldavian, Transylvanian, and the dialect of the Banat* (Ivănescu, 1948:91, translated by the author). From his point of view, the language of texts written during the sixteenth century was influenced by the northern variants. That influence diminished and almost disappeared during the following centuries, when the cultural centres moved towards the south.

Ion Ghetie's view of the dialectal basis of the Romanian literary language generally coincides with that of Ivănescu, as he also distinguished between several distinct literary variants based on Daco-Romanian sub-dialects that were in use until the second half of the nineteenth century, when the unification of the literary language, on the basis of the Wallachian literary variant but with major contributions from the other variants, took place.

The unification process of the Romanian literary variants was deliberately initiated after 1780, when the first printed grammar appeared, and continued until the late nineteenth century through the efforts of the most prominent Romanian scholars. In their efforts to standardize the modern literary language, those scholars conformed to the criteria invoked by Petru Maior and Heliade Rădulescu: *Latin, grammar, geographical distribution, and euphonic criteria* (Ghetie, 1975:628, translated by the author). It was the Wallachian literary variant that most closely fit these criteria. The other literary variants also contributed to the formation and improvement of the language structure, especially in the field of morphology and vocabulary.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMANIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE UNTIL THE MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The sixteenth century is important for the development of the Romanian literary language because the oldest literary Romanian texts known so far date back to this period. However, although it is an irrefutable fact that Romanian must have been used in writing before 1500, the oldest text preserved is *Scrisoarea lui Neacşu din Cîmpulung* (*The letter of Neacşu from Cîmpulung*), dated 1521. The economic, political, and cultural changes which occurred during the sixteenth century in the three Romanian Provinces – Wallachia, Moldavia, and Transylvania – such as the development of market exchange, trade and crafts, the decrease of the Slavic culture on Romanian territory, and the influence of some foreign religious denominations, particularly in Transylvania, favoured the tendency towards Romania's emancipation and its rejection of the Slavic language used by the Church and administration. This resulted in a large amount

of translations from Slavic and Hungarian, which provide the proof of a written language. It was the initial phase of the literary language development, its incipient manifestation and expression which initiated the process of transforming Romanian into a cultivated language.

In Transylvania, where most of the first monuments of the preserved Romanian literary language came from, the conditions of using Romanian in writing were more favourable during the sixteenth century than in Moldavia and Wallachia, where Slavic was privileged. First of all, this was because the status of Slavic was flimsier in Transylvania, where it was used only in the Romanian Orthodox Church. Secondly, European ideas penetrated more easily into this province and favoured the use of national language in writing. The protestant reform had already been accepted in Transylvania, and the Lutheran and Calvinist clerics, in pursuit of proselytes, approved and supported the translation of religious books into Romanian. And last but not least, we must mention the strong national feeling among the Romanians living in Transylvania, which urged them to defend and cultivate their national language during centuries of foreign oppression.

The religious books of the sixteenth century, which were translated, copied, and printed in several cultural centres situated in Sibiu, Orăştie, Braşov, northern Transylvania, northern Moldavia and even Rhodes Island, are considered the most important monuments of the old Romanian literary language.

By their comprehensive language and large popularity, the religious books printed in southern Transylvania after 1544 represent by far the most important monuments of the literary language: the *Catechism* (1544) and the *Slavic-Romanian Gospel* (1551-1553) printed in Sibiu, *Palia of Orăştie* (1582) the Romanian version of the first two *Books (Genesis and Exodus)* are the work of a group of translators from southern Transylvania, followed by Deacon Coresi's eleven books printed in Braşov between 1559 and 1580, and considered to represent the beginning of the Romanian literary language: *Catehismul (The Catechism)* (1559-1550), *Tetraevanghelul (The Four Gospels)* (1561), *Pravila* (1560-1562), *Apostolul (The Apostle)* (1563), *Cazania I (Homiliary I)* and *Molitvenicul (Book of prayer)* (1567), *Psaltirea (The Psalter)* (1570), *Liturghierul (The Liturgy)* (1570), *Psaltirea (The Psalter)* (1577), *Psaltirea (The Psalter)* (1576-1578), *Cazania II (Homiliary II)* (1581).

A *Book of Songs*, Calvinist songs, also known as the *Todorescu Fragment*, was printed in Cluj, with Latin characters and Hungarian orthography.

In north Transylvania the so-called rhotacizing texts were printed, which include *the Codex of Voroneţ, the Psalter of Voroneţ, the Psalter of Scheia*, and *the Hurmuzachi Psalter*. These are considered to be the oldest translations in Romanian, but in fact, the preserved manuscripts are only copies of the lost originals and it is difficult to date and locate them. According to Ion Ghetie, *the language used in the rhotacizing texts joined together two language strata: a southern one and a northern one. It is very likely that the southern type belongs to the original, and the northern to the copyist* (Ghetie, 1975:213, translated by

the author). As to the period in which they were written, *various estimates span the period between the tenth and the seventeenth century. The proper manuscripts belong to the sixteenth century; the Psalter of Scheia and the Psalter of Voroneţ belong to the later half of the century; the Hurmuzachi Psalter and the Codex of Voroneţ have not been precisely dated, but it is not unlikely that they were written after 1550* (Gheţie, 1975:232).

Pravila, written by Lucaci, and the *Glosses*, which is a Romanian translation of a Slavic judicial text, were published in northern Moldavia.

The *Four Gospels*, copied in 1574 by Radu of Maniceşti on the island of Rhodes at the order of Patraşcu Voivode and preserved in the British Museum in London, also deserve to be mentioned among the most important monuments of old literary language.

The linguistic structure of the Romanian texts up to the year 1640 show a close relation between the language of these texts and the vernaculars spoken in the regions where they were written, translated, or copied, but they do not represent an exact reproduction of any of the Daco-Romanian vernaculars.

The current Romanian standard language uses the following segmental units: seven vowels, four semivowels, an asyllabic devocalized vowel /ʲ/ in final position, and twenty consonants. We will describe them before embarking on a discussion about the changes they underwent in the course of time.

Vowels

The vowel inventory of the Romanian language contains seven phonemes, which have different phonetic variations:

- /a/ as in *amar* – open central unlabial vowel;
- /e/ as in *elev* – mid anterior unlabial vowel;
- /i/ as in *iris* – closed anterior unlabial vowel;
- /o/ as in *ocol* – mid posterior labial vowel;
- /u/ as in *uluc* – closed posterior labial vowel;
- /ə/ as in *fără* – mid central unlabial vowel;
- /î/ as in *vârî* – closed central unlabial vowel.

In some unadapted loanwords, two more vowels are preserved, similar to those in the original language, which do not belong to the basic inventory of phonemes of the Romanian language but which are used by educated people; they are mentioned here because they appear in words that have become part of the language language:

- /ø/ as in *bleu, loess* – middle anterior labial vowel;
- /y/ as in *führer* – closed anterior labial vowel.

Semivowels

The status of semivowels in Romanian is a vexed question; some of the specialists consider them to be asyllabic allophones of their corresponding vowels, while others give them a distinct place among the phonemes of the language.

There are four semivowels in Romanian, and they correspond to the vowels: /e/, /i/, /o/, /u/:

- /ẹ/ as in *deal*;
- /i̯/ as in *fier, cai*;
- /ǫ/ as in *coasă*;
- /u̯/ as in *ziua, leu*.

The semivowels /e/ and /o/ can be placed only in front of a vowel, while /i̯/ and /u/ can be placed both in front and after a vowel as can be seen in the examples above.

The asyllabic devocalized vowel /ʲ/

At the end of some Romanian words such as *rupi, moşi, dormi, bani*, native speakers perceive the existence of a different, distinct sound that always follows after a consonant and is somehow similar to the vowel /i/, from which it in fact initially originates. The same sound sometimes appears in the interior of certain words such as *oricine, caţiva, cincisprezece*. From the phonetic point of view, this sound does not exist as a distinct utterance but represents the palatalization of the preceding consonant.

Consonants

- /p/: voiceless bilabial occlusive, as in: *pace, aparte, cap*;
- /b/: voiced bilabial occlusive, as in: *bun, abac, cub*;
- /t/: voiceless alveolar occlusive, as in: *tare, ating, sat*;
- /d/: voiced alveolar occlusive, as in: *dor, odihni, rod*;
- /k/: velar voiceless occlusive, as in: *cal, acolo, rac*, realized as the allophone [c]: voiceless palatal occlusive, as in: *chel, achit, ochi*;
- /g/: voiced velar occlusive, as in: *gol, ogar, rog*;
- /ts/: voiceless alveolar affricate, as in: *ţap, otet, maţ*;
- /tʃ/: voiceless postalveolar affricate, as in: *cer, ace, taci*;
- /dʒ/: voiced postalveolar affricate, as in: *ger, magic, rogi*;
- /f/: voiceless labiodental fricative, as in: *foc, afară, puf*;
- /v/: voiced labiodental fricative, as in: *var, covor, mov*;
- /s/: voiceless alveolar fricative, as in: *sare, masă, cos*;
- /z/: voiced alveolar fricative, as in: *zar, vază, roz*;
- /ʃ/: voiceless postalveolar fricative, as in: *şarpe, aşa, coş*;
- /ʒ/: voiced postalveolar fricative, as in: *jar, ajutor, vrej*;
- /h/: voiceless glottal fricative, as in: *ham, rahat*;
- /m/: voiced nasal bilabial, as in: *măr, amic, cum*;
- /n/: voiced alveolar nasal, as in: *nor, sună, an*, realized as the allophone [ŋ]: voiced velar nasal, as in: *prunc, gong, branhie*;
- /l/: voiced alveolar lateral, as in: *lung, ales, mal*;
- /r/: voiced alveolar vibrant, as in: *rai, arid, far*.

Bringing the discussion back to the cultivated literary manifestations of the first stage of the old literary language, the main phonetic characteristics are:

Vowels:

- the preservation of *ă* in words such as *băserecă, blăstema, fămeie, năsip, rădica, părete, pahar, rădica, răsipi*, except in Coresi's texts, where it changed into *e, i*, as in *beserecă, ridica*;

- *ă* in protonic position changed to *a*: *îmbracat, înaltară, marturie, napaste, spalat*; this change cannot be seen in Coresi's texts: *îmbrăcat, înalţară, mărturie*;

- *e* was not syncopated in *derept, dereptate, derege*; *e* changed to *i* by dissimilation in *direptăţile*;

- *e* was preserved in certain words: *arepi, ceti, demîneaţă, lepi, neşte, nemeri, preveghea*; in parallel, the forms sometimes appear spelt with *i* instead of *e*;

- *e* > *ă* in *Dumnadzău*;

- unstressed *e* in final position changed to *i* in words such as *di, durerili, iuti, ferici, va adaugi, nebuneli*, but it was preserved in Coresi's *Four Gospels: va adauge, nebunele*;

- unstressed **e** in medial position changed to *i* in some cases: *blastimă, întinireşte, picioarilor, facirile, oamini, neustinindu-se, şidea, şizu, videa* but was preserved in words like *feciorul, se vedem, vor veni* and in Coresi's texts: *neostenindu-se, şedea*;

- the epenthesis of *i* did not occur in *cîne, mîne, pîne*, except in Coresi's texts in words such as *cîine, mîine, pîine*, where we can also find the plural form of *mînă – mîinile* alternating with *mînile*;

- *î* was preserved in: *împle, îmbla, îmfla*; in Coresi's texts, *î* > *u* was noticed twice: *umplut, umpluse*;

- *î* > *u* by assimilation in *curund* but most often *curînd*;

- unstressed o > **u** in *adurmi, curabie, cutrupiţi, cuperi, descuperi, durmi, uspăţ, îngrupat, înfluri*; the phonetism with o is rare: *coperi, descoperi, înflori, înflorira, ospăţ*;

- preservation of *u* in *preut, preutului, preuteasa, usteni, ustenesc*, forms spelt with *o* are very rare;

- *u* was syncopated in *uscă, uscă-se*, but we also come across *usucă-se*;

- *u* > *î* in *frîmseţe, porîncă*;

- *u* > *v* in *dziva, să căvtăm*;

- the hiatus *ă-u* > *o* in *denlontru, dinlontru, înlontru, lontru*; it was preserved in the texts printed in Braşov: *lăuntru*;

- when in final position, the diphthong *eá* > *e(e)*: *be, me, re, veţi ave, va căde, vreţi vre, voiu pute, va pute*, but forms like *avea, va putea* similar to modern Romanian can also be seen; in Coresi's texts this change never occurs: *mea*;

- **iá was** preserved in baiatul, apropiat, apropia-se-voru, taiate, taiat-ai;

- *iu* was reduced to *i* in *mincinoşi (*in the Palia of Orăştie*)*, but was preserved in the Slavic-Romanian Gospel printed in Sibiu – *minciunoşi*, and in rotacizing texts – *menciu(r)os*; in Coresi's texts we meet both forms: *minciunos* (*iu* preserved), but also *mincinos, mencinos* (the most commonly used forms).

Consonants:

- labials were preserved intact: *binele, fiiul, fiarăle, lumina, piciorul, pierde, pita*; they were not palatalized in the Palia of Orăştie – *să fiu, pierdea, vierme*; in rotacizing texts and in those printed in northern Moldavia, labials were

also preserved entirely intact, but there are still few exceptions namely *f* > *h'*: *heru, hi, va hi, hie, hină, hir*;

- hard realization of the labial consonants is noticed in a series of examples where *e* > *ă* and *ea* > *a*: *mărg, mărgînd, să margă, isprăvască, iubăscu, ivăsc, pântru, răpasca, zmău*; still, there are cases, quite numerous in the rotacizing texts, when labial consonants are followed by *e, ea,* which indicates a soft realization of these consonants: *iubesc, potrivescu-l, zmeu*; in the Palia of Orăştie we also see cases of hard labial consonants, but soft variants prevail here as well as in Coresi's texts: *blagoslovesc, să isprăvească, să meargă, mergînd, tocmeală, veşmînt, iubes, ivescu, tocmeala*; the soft realization of *b* was noticed in the Slavic-Romanian Gospel and the rotacizing texts: *beu, beutor*; but in Coresi's texts the realization of *b* is hard in words like: *băutură, băutoriu, am băut*; in the Palia there is an alternation of soft and hard realiations of *b* in the forms of the verb *a bea*: *era beut, beu, beură* and also *băi, băui*;

- the labial consonant *m* was preserved in *rumpe*; in Coresi's texts the form *rumpe* alternates with *rupe*;

- *mn* > *un* in *scaun, scaunul* in the texts of the Slav-Romanian Gospel, the Palia of Orăştie;

- *n* in intervocalic position was preserved in words of Latin origin: *cînilor, lumina, minciunoşi*; in words of Latin origin, *n* in intervocalic position changed to *r* (*nr*) in the rotacizing texts, which is their characteristic feature: *cîri, mîrule, punrea*; exceptions are very rare: *bătrîneţele, întunerecu, suspinarea*; in Coresi's texts *n* > *r* in *amăruntul, amerinţa*;

- *n* in intervocalic position didn't change to *r* in the text of Palia: *bine, mînă, vinul*;

- *ń* was preserved and it prevails in the texts in *pustinea, se nu spuni, spunind, întîniu, vinea, cunele, călcîniu, întîniu*; in the rotacizing texts *ń* > *i* appears in *cuvios, întîi, întîiele, spuiu*;

- in some cases, the hard realization of *s* was noticed, which caused the change of *i* > *î* or of the diphthong *ea* > *a*: *samănă, se asamănă, sară, sara, sîmt, sîngur, săminţe*; nevertheless, in Palia the phonetisms with *e, i, ea* – prevail: *culeseră, seară, simţi, singur*; in Coresis's texts the soft realization of *s* is a rule: *arseră, seară, singur* with some exceptions: *înţăleasără, săcure, ucisără*;

- the hard realization of *dz* and *ţ*, as in *audzînd, dzua* (< *dzîua*), *curăţaşte, cuţitul, feriţi-vă, puţîn*, coexists with the soft realization, as in *audzi, dinţilor, svinţeşte*;

- the soft realization of *ş* prevails in the text printed in Sibiu; still, its hard realization is occurs as well: *ieşind, şî, cenuşă, roşiu*; both realizations of this consonant are met in case *ş* is followed by *ě* and the next syllable contains *e*: *deşarte, greşalele, şapte* and also *greşelele, roşeşte, grijeşte*; in Coresi's texts, as a rule, after *ş* and *j* the vowels *e* and *i* are preserved: *deşert, va griji*, although there are lots of exceptions, especially those that concern the rendering of *e* to a velar position: *cerşînd, deşărt, grija, înşală, uşă*;

- *ş* did not change into *s* in *deschide*; the form *deschise* can be found once in the Palia;

- preservation of the affricates *dz* (< the Latin *d* + *e, i*) and *ğ* (< the Latin *j* + *o, u* or words of other origin): *Dumnedzeu, dzile, dzise, gios, se giudece, giugul, giumătate, giurară*; still, there are some rare cases (the Sibiu text, the Palia of Orăştie) when we meet the affricate consonants *z* and *j* instead of *dz* and *ğ*, respectively: *auzira, şaizeci, zice, Domnezeu, nu judecareţi*. In Coresi's texts we notice the soft realization of the affricate consonant *z*: *Dumnezeu, să păzească, zi*; the Latin *d* + *e, i* is always rendered by *z*: *auzi, zeul, zilele*; *dz* does not occur in Coresi's texts. *Ğ* (< the Latin *j* + *o, u* and in words like *gios, giumătate, giupîn*) > *j*: *ajutoriu, judecată, împrejurul, jos, jumătate, jupîn*; *ğ* is seen only in *giude*; in the rotacizing texts this change does not occur, so we find: *giudeţu, gios*; the use of *ğ* is general in Moldavian texts, where only once can one find *judecata*;

- *r* placed before *e, i*, will be softly realized: *se pogori, reu, ridea, uriţi*, but most often its hard realization is noticed: *să te araţi, răbdătoriu, rău, urăsc, mohorît, urît, pogorîndu-se*; in the text of Palia the alternation of *i* and *î* occurs and in this case *r* is part of the *str* consonant group: *strimb-strîmb, strimbătate-strîmbătate*;

- *r* is soft in *-ar, -tor* suffixes: *cocătoriul, dătătoriu, pierzătoriu*;

- the hard utterance of *r* when followed by *ĕ*: *urĕşte*;

- the hard utterance of *t* in the Palia: *stăjarilor*, although the soft utterance prevails: *aşteaptă, stingerea, steagul*;

- the laryngeal consonant *h* was preserved in *pohtă, vatah, prah, vîrh* in the text of the Slavic-Romanian Gospel, in the rotacizing texts, and in Coresi's texts; in the Palia it was also preserved in *prah, zăduh*, but changed to *f* in *poftă, pofteşti, vîrf*.

It is obvious that all literary variants until the middle of the seventeenth century preserved, as phonetic rules, some archaic phonetisms which later would be restricted to only certain areas, and that beyond these common characteristics there are others that differentiate between the northern and southern literary variants.

In northern variants (those of Maramureş, Banat, northern Moldavia) we notice fhe following characteristics:

- the preservation of affricates *dz* (< Latin *d* + *e, i*) and *ğ* (< Latin *j* + *o, u* or words of other origin); *dzile, dzise, gios, gioc, giumătate*, etc.;

- the preservation of etymological forms without the epenthesis of *i* in *cîne, mîne, pîne*;

- the hard realizations of the labial consonants, the fricative consonant *s*, and the affricate consonants *ţ* and *dz*: *iubăsc, ivăsc, mărg, potopăsc, asamănă, audzînd, dzîcă, puţîn*;

- the soft realization of *r* in the suffixes *-ar* and *-tor*: *agiutoriu, dătătoriu, mărgăritariu*.

Some of the phonetisms are characteristic of only some of the northern variants:

- the transformation of intervocalic *n* to *n(r)* in words of Latin origin is a peculiarity of the texts printed in Maramureş, but can also be seen in the those of northern Moldavia;

- the preservation of *ń* in words like *cunele, pustine* is characteristic of the texts printed in Banat, but occurs in rotacizing texts as well: *călcîniu, întîniu, etc*;

- the change of *e* in medial position or of unstressed *e* in final position into *i* (*oamini, bini*) is a characteristic of the northern Moldavian variant; so is the alternation of labio-dental *f (+i)* and *h´*: *fir – hir, fi – h, i* but it is noticeable in Maramureş texts as well.

The southern variant has the following peculiarities:

- the constant rendering of *the Latin d + e, i* by *z*, and of *the Latin j + o, u* by *j*: *zi, joc*;

- the epenthesis of *i* in *cîine, mîine, pîine*;

- usually, the fricatives *s* and *z*, the affricate *ţ*, and the labial consonants are not hard: *seară, înţelepciune, Dumnezeu, iubesc*;

- after *s, ţ.* and *r* the diphthong *ea* > *a* (when there is an *e* in the following syllable): *şarpe, grijaşte* – (this phenomenon occurs in northern texts, but it alternates with the soft realization of the three consonants).

It can be concluded that during the sixteenth century the phonetic structure of the Romanian literary language was not unitary, and no variant exercised a decisive influence upon the others, since the regional phonetic characteristics did not turn into general rules for the other literary variants.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE LITERARY ROMANIAN LANGUAGE FROM THE MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURY UNTIL THE LATTER HALF OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The printing of religious texts translated into Romanian during the sixteenth century did not represent the moment when Slavic was replaced by the use of the native language; in Wallachia and Moldavia, where the Slavic tradition was stronger than in Transylvania, the texts, being of Lutheran and Calvinist influence, weren't welcomed.

That is why the proper, official translation and printing of religious books did not really begin in these provinces until around the mid-seventeenth century, when scholars and voivodes encouraged and supported the use of Romanian in church and government; Romanian started to be regarded as a continuation of Latin, the language of European culture. Consequently, the process of promoting it as a means of literary and scientific expression began. It was during the eighteenth century that Romanian became the official national language of the Romanian people and culture.

The monuments of the literary language of the period under discussion are not only religious but also secular texts. Among the most important are the following:

- in Transylvania: *The New Testament* (1648), *The Psalter* (1651), the books published by Ioan Zoba: *The golden coffin* (*Sicriul de aur*) (1683), *Cărare pre scurt* (1685), *Ceasloveţ* (1687), *Molitvenic* (1689), *The flower of truth* (*Floarea adevărului*) (1750), *Ceaslovul* (1751), *Liturghierul* (1756), *Evanghelia* (1765).

- in Moldavia: *Cazania* of Bishop Varlaam (1643), Dosoftei's *Psaltirea în versuri* (1673), *Viaţa şi petrecerea svinţilor* (1682-1686), *Psaltirea slavo-româna* (1680), *Octoihul* (1683); *Liturghier* (1747), *Triod* (1747), *Molitvenic* (1749), *Octoih* (1749), *Ceaslov* (1750), *Penticostar* (1753), *Evanghelie* (1762).

The chroniclers Grigore Ureche, Miron Costin, Ion Neculce, and Dimitrie Cantemir, voivode of Moldavia, left the most valuable historical works of the period: several chronicles of Moldavia, a philosophical work, and an allegorical novel. *Carte românească de învăţătura,* also known as *Pravila lui Vasile Lupu* (1646), is a book of civil law, translated from Greek and Italian.

- in Wallachia: *Evanghelie învăţătoare* (1642), *Mistirio* (1651), *Tîrnosanie* (1652); after 1680 there was a flourishing period in the field of printing: *Evanghelia* (1682), *Apostolul* (1683), *Biblia de la Bucureşti* (1688). Through the efforts of Antim Ivireanu, Wallachia's future bishop, *Psaltirea* (1694), *Evanghelie* (1697), *Molitvenic* (1706), and *Osmoglasnic* (1706) were published, as well as many other important works necessary for the church service to be performed in the native language.

Besides some books of canonical law, *Pravila* (Govora, 1640), *Şepte taine* (1644), a book on civil law, *Îndreptarea legii* (1652), was also published.

In Wallachia the following names are associated with the secular texts: Radu Greceanu, Constantin Cantacuzino, Radu Popescu, and Dimitrie Eustatievici Braşoveanul, to whom we owe the first Romanian grammar, *Gramatica rumânească* (1757), preserved in manuscript form.

The phonetic structure of the cultivated Romanian language between 1640 and 1780 is not very much different from that of the preceding period; consequently, in all literary variants, several common archaic phonetisms will act as rules:

- *ă* was preserved in: *blăstăma, fămei, fărmăcătoriu, lăcui, împărăţia, păhar, rădica, răsipi, să mulţămiţi*;

- *e* was preserved in: *arepi, ceti, cetire, den, dente, inemă, neşte, nemeri, nemică, precepuţi, tremes*;

- in most works, *î* was preserved in: *împle, vor împlea, să împlu, îmbla, veţi îmbla, îmfla*;

- *î > i* in words such as: *atita, ride, sint, singe, tiner, tinerul*;

- *ia* did not change to *ie*, and this spelling prevails in: *iaste, grăiaşte, înnoiaşte, neapropiiat, priiaten, trebuiaşte, să-l chiiame*;

Some innovations that would be used later in works belonging to the modern literary period can be seen in the printed texts in Wallachia:

- by assimilation *ă > i*: *ridica, risipi, risipeşte, s-au ridicat, s-au risipit*;

- *e > i* in *biserică, citi, dimineaţă, din, dintre, nişte, nimeri*;

- under the influence of *m, î > u*: *umfla, umflarea, umflătură, umbla, umblăm, să umble, umple, se umplură*;

- *ia > ie* in *boier, grăieşte, înnoieşte, prieten*;

- in Grigore Ureche's and Miron Costin's works we can find the form *român* (spelt with *o* under the influence of Latin) which was extended to the derivatives: *român, românește, românesc* (G. Ureche), *român, românește, Ţara Românească*, together with *rumân* (M. Costin). (Rosetti et al., 1971:588)

Along with these phonetic rules, common to the written language used on the territory of the three Romanian provinces, there are also coexisting phonetisms that differentiate between the northern and southern variants, as well as other regional phonetic phenomena.

The northern literary variants:

- preserve, in words of Latin origin, the affricates *dz* and *ğ* (*dzi, cădzură, vădzură, gioc, gios, giudeca*); yet, in the texts printed in southwestern Transylvania *dz* alternates with *z*: *miedzul - miezul, dzi - zi* (Gheţie, 1975:353);

- the epenthesis of *i* is absent in the etymological forms *mîne, cîne, pîne*; nevertheless, rarely did the diphthongized forms occur;

- the soft realization of *r* in the suffixes *-ar, -tor*: *cuptoriu, învăţătoriu, dătătoriu*;

- the velarization of *e* and *i*, when preceded by labial consonants or by *s, dz (z), ţ,* or *r*, occurs more often than in the texts of the preceding period.

Some of the northern variants show a tendency towards individualization; the northern Moldavian variant, as it appears in some texts, accepts regional, folk phonetisms characteristic of the central Moldavian vernaculars that alternate with the oldest and most common ones:

- *a* in protonic position *> a*: *barbat, scapatu, ramasă*;

- the diphthong *ea > e* in: *avè, bè, băte, dzice, mieluşe, înfaşe, păre, vide, să de*;

- *ia > ie* particularly in final position: *abiè, spărie, tăiet, întîrdziet*;

- unstressed *e* in final or medial position changed to *i* in: *aproapi, ari, buni, careli, civa, cini, ciniva, di, dragostile, ficioară, grelili, mari, răutatili, vinire, vom vini*;

- *e* and *ea* after labials changed to *ă, a* when followed by a syllable with a palatal or soft sound: *bat, să marga, mărg, vorovăscu*;

- the velarization of *e* and *i*, after *s, z, ş, j, ţ,* or *r* is very common, but this did not become a rule, as they alternate with forms in which *e, i*, are preserved;

- the palatalization of the labio-dental *f* (in words of Latin or other origin) occur very often, but this did not turn into a rule either, as they alternate with forms in which *f* was not palatalized: *hiiu-său, hiica, a hi, trandahirul* (Rosetti, 1971:137);

- one phonetic archaism is the preservation of the diphthong *ea* that originates in *é* and when there is an *e* or *i* in the following syllable. Although this diphthong have changed to *e* in southern variants ever since the sixteenth century, Dosoftei was still using it in his writings: *seate, dzeace, creaşte, easte* (Rosetti et al., 1971:136);

- the use of another phonetic archaism, *u* placed at the end of words ending in a consonant or a consonant cluster, frequently used by the Moldavian scholars: *picioru, spătaru, acestu, cîndu, căznescu, multu* can be explained by its use in everyday speech.

The Transylvanian literary variant is characterized by:

- the disappearance of rhotacism, which brings it closer to the Moldavian and the southwest Transylvanian variants;

- the use of *z* instead of *dz* in words of Latin origin;

- more frequent alternation of *î* and *îi. cîne-cîine*;

- more frequent alternation of *ǧ* and *j*: *gios-jos*.

The phonetic structure of the Wallachian literary variant knew few changes, as compared to the preceding period; consequently, the following rules are fundamental:

- the use of *z* (*zic*) and *j* (*joc*) in words of Latin origin;

- the use of the diphthong *îi* in: *cîine, mîine, pîine*;

- the change of the diphthong *ea* into *a* after *ş, j*, or *r*: *grijaşte, şarpe, uraşte*;

- as a rule, the consonants *s, z, t*, and *r* followed by *e*, or *i* are not hard; they coexist with the soft forms;

- the fricatives *ş* and *j* followed by *e* or *i* are rendered hard in less and less cases.

At the end of the seventeenth century, printing activity moved from Oltenia towards the centre of Wallachia, and as a consequence, some regional elements belonging to the variety spoken in this region are excluded, and concurrently there appear some innovations caused by contact with the new varieties spoken in the centre of the principality:

- *i* is syncopated in: *drept, dreptate, nedreptate*;

- quite frequently, in secular texts, *d* and *p* are rendered hard; *dămult, dăstul, pă, a păscui*;

- in all texts, but more frequently in chronicles, *î > u*: *umbla, umfla*;

- forms like *nisip, ridica, citi* do occur, but they do not outnumber the old forms;

- the form *să* of the reflexive pronoun *se* occurs in general use: *să mira, să întîmplase*.

As soon as Romanian became the language in which the religious service was performed, the necessity of providing religious books imposed an increase in translating and printing activity, which was successfully achieved by Antim Ivireanul during the first decades of the eighteenth century. The wide circulation of the books printed in Wallachia caused the decrease in printing activity in

Transylvania and Moldavia and the religious unity of the Romanian people. Translated and printed in Wallachia, the texts bore the mark of the Wallachian variety of Romanian, which gained priority over the others because its linguistics rules, representing the most elaborate and accurate aspect of the literary language, imposed themselves in use not only in religious texts but also in secular texts in both Moldavia and Transylvania, determining the beginning of linguistic unification.

The period between the years 1780 and 1836 marks the beginning of a long process of modernization of the Romanian culture, oriented now towards the West, under the influence of the Enlightenment ideology, on the basis of which the creed of the cultural movement of the *Transylvanian School* (*Şcoala Ardeleană*) was founded. In the field of linguistics the representatives of the *Transylvanian School* strove to prove the Latin origin of the Romanian language as well as the Romanian people's continuity on its present territory, and consequently, their activity was directed towards elaborating a new Romanian spelling system founded on the etymological principle, issuing grammar books, dictionaries, and works dealing with the rules of spelling, which, in the future, was to be done using Latin and not Cyrillic characters. This was an event of particular importance in the process of linguistic unification.

In his *Romanian Grammar* (*Gramatica Românesca*) (1828), Ion Heliade Rădulescu proposed an alphabet consisting of 30 letters, which was a major contribution to the replacement of the Cyrillic alphabet by the Latin, which was officially adopted in the three Romanian principalities in 1860. He also asserted that the foundation of the new literary Romanian should be the language of the religious texts, because of their unitary linguistic character. In his conception, elements with non-Latin origins and with morphologically or phonetically inappropriate evolutions were to be eliminated and replaced with alternatives of Latin origin, which were grammatically correct and widely used, selected from the other Romanian varieties. As a matter of fact Rădulescu *deliberately accepts as a basis of unification, the language of religious texts, namely the unique Wallachian literary language of 1750-1780* (Gheţie, 1975:491), which was closer to Latin because of its phonetism, characteristic of the conservative Wallachian dialect.

As far as phonetics is concerned, Rădulescu himself called for the following rules and tendencies:
- Moldavian forms of the words *carili, binile, trii, el vorbeşti, ci* in which *e* changes to *i* are considered inappropriate; *carele, binele, trei, el vorbeşte, ce* are correct;
- forms with *ă*: *înţaleg, zisă, iubăsc, galbăn* should be abandoned and those with *e* should be used instead: *înţeleg, zise, iubesc, galben*.
- *prea, mea, putea* – ending in *ea* – should replace those ending in *e*: *pre, me, puţe*.
- the diphthong *ea* should be preserved after *s*: *seară, seamănă* not *sara, samănă*;

- *cîne, mîne, pîne* are considered appropriate;
- *singur* is correct, not *sîngur*;
- the prepositions *pe* and *de* must have these forms and not the ones used in Moldavia, *pi* and *di*, or in Wallachia, *pă* and *dă*.

Despite the regional differences, the literary variants during this period show common characteristics and a tendency towards loans of Latin origin. In the field of phonetics, literary Romanian is characterised by the giving up of some archaic forms, such as the diphthong *ia* > *ie* (*prieten*), and *dz* > *z* in all northern variants. There are some old phonetisms kept in use mainly because they are illustrative of our Latinity: *ă* in *pahar, rădica, risipi, î* in *împle, îmbla, îmfla* (the forms spelt with *u* occur only in the Wallachian variant), *î* > *i* in *ride, sint, singe*; for the sake of the same principle, Transylvanian scholars accepted some other old, popular phonetisms in case they served their purpose well. For example:

- *j* and *z* are accepted instead of *ğ* and *dz* (*joc, judeţ, zic, auzi*) but *ğ* is preserved in words like: *împregiur, încongiura* because they remind of the Latin origin – *gyrus*;
- for the same reason, the forms *cîne, pîne, mîne* continued to be used in cultivated language until the end of the nineteenth century;
- words in which *e* (*i*) was not syncopated; *direg, diregătorie, dirept*;
- the spelling with *î* and *ă* was avoided and regional forms like: *beutură, reu, strein, tinăr, a uri* were used instead of *băutură, răú, străin, tînăr, a urî*.

The phonetisms characteristic of the Moldavian variant for this period, kept in use until after 1870 when abandoned under the pressure of the unitary norms, are the following: the preservation of the affricate *ğ* (*gioc, giudecată*); the forms *cîne, pîne, mîne*; the soft realization of *r* in suffixes *-ar, -tor*; and *ă* in protonic position > *a*; *e* in medial or final position > *i*: *adivărul, ci, pi*; the change of the diphthong *ea* in final position into *e*; the change of *ia* into *ie*: *spăriet*; the hard realization of *s, z, t, ş*, and *j*; sporadic palatalization of *f*.

In Wallachia the language follows the norms of the eighteenth century, but some regional characteristics are preserved: the velarization of *e* and *i* after the consonants *d* and *p*. *dă, pă, dăştept, dăstul, pîn*.

The year 1881 included a major step towards linguistic unification: the Romanian Academy adopted the first spelling rules, successively reformed in 1904, when the etymological principle in writing was abandoned in favour of the phonetical principle, in 1932, and in 1953.

What characterizes the spelling reform of 1904 is that, in some cases, the Romanian Academy refrained from *giving definite solutions, preferring to suggest, as being literary, two competitive phonetisms or forms* (Ghetie, 1975:555). The Wallachian forms were in most cases suggested as the only correct ones – *blestema, pereche, perete, reteza, ridica, risipă, şapte, şarpe, şase,* (Ghetie, 1975:555) but they were also put together with those belonging to the Transylvanian or Moldavian varieties, or the ones that had been in use before 1880, upon which they would finally prevail.

In the 1932 reform, the Romanian Academy declares as correct:
- the hard realization of *ş* and *j* in words like: *cenuşă, cireaşă, uşă, vrajă*;
- the soft realization, characteristic of the Wallachian variant, of *ş, j* in words like: *clujean, orăşean, greşeală*;
- *seamănă, seară*, and *ţeapă* instead of *samănă, sară*, and *ţapă* – characteristic of the northern variants;
- as to the soft or hard realization of the consonant *ţ*, the Academy gives the writer the liberty to choose between: *bătrîneţe- bătrîneţă, tinereţe- tinereţă, blîndeţe- blîndeţă*.

In 1953 the changes in the field of phonetics state the following rules published in reference works which declared as literary the following Wallachian forms and phonetisms:
- the use of *a*, not *ă*, in *pahar*; the use of *a*, not *ă* or *e*, in *datora*; the use of *a*, not *e*, in *băşică, băut, băutură*; the use of *ă*, not *e* or *i*, in *străin*; the use of *e*, not *ă*, in *blestem, lepăda, necaz, pereche, perete, rezema, speria*; the use of *e*, not *i*, in *creier, greier*; *e(i)* syncopated in *drege*; the use of *i*, not *e*, in *citi*; the use of *i*, not *ă* or *î*, in *ghici, intra, nisip, ridica, risipă*; the use of *i*, not *iu*, in *mincinos*; the use of *î*, not *ă*, in *călcîi, căpătîi, întîi, pînă*; the use of *u*, not *ă*, in *mulţumi*; the use of *u*, not *î*, in *umbla, umfla, umple*; the use of *u*, not *o*, in *porunci*; *u* not syncopated in *usuc, usucă*; the use of *ïi*, not *î*, in *cîine, mine, pîine*; epenthetic *p* does not occur in *îndărăt*; the use of *n*, not *r*, in *amănunt*; *n* was disseminated in *genunchi, mănunchi*; soft realization of *t* in *stinge*; soft realization of *s, z, t* in *seamă, seară, ţeapă, ţeapăn, zeamă, zer*; soft utterance of *ţ* in *bătrîneţe, frumuseţe, tinereţe*; hard realization of *s, j* in *grijă, mătuşă, păpuşă, strajă*; soft realization of *s, j* in *greşeală, oblojeală, orăşean* except for *şea, şeade, jear*; hard realization of *ş* in *şade, şapte, şarpe, şase*; hard realization of *r* in *crăpa*; soft realization of *r* in *repede*; hard realization of *r* in *hotărăşte, tîrăşte*; *r > l* in *tulbura, tulbure* but preserved in *urcior* (Ghetie, 1975:557).

To conclude, we can say that the period between 1532 and 1588 is considered the beginning of the Romanian literary language, which manifested itself into four literary variants – Wallachian, northern Transylvanian, northern Moldavian, southwest Transylvanian, and the variant of the regions of Banat and Hunedoara, which did not influence each other and which, towards the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century, consolidated themselves around the main cultural centres of the three Romanian principalities: one in Moldavia around Iaşi, where the literary norms would be imposed by the works of Varlaam; another in Wallachia around Tîrgovişte after printing activity moved there from Oltenia and the literary peculiarities of the region disappeared and the third in Transylvania around Alba Iulia. These literary variants would impose themselves as norms in the three Romanian provinces. The decrease in the printing activity in Moldavia and Transylvania towards the end of the seventeenth century, the nationalization of the holy service (concluded during the former half of the eighteenth century), the unprecedented rate of printing religious books in Wallachia and their consequent wider circulation in the other

principalities all led to the greater influence of the Wallachian literary variant upon the others and to its settlement as the unique literary standard of printed religious texts. Still, the language used in secular books, whose number was steadily increasing towards the end of the eighteenth century, as well the language used by famous writers in their works, tended to preserve and even imposed some regional peculiarities, which was the result of the coming together of the literary language and its popular aspect, and of the separate development of the three Romanian provinces until their union in 1918; some of the most important writers deliberately used regional varieties in their works, so that they could better render the atmosphere of the time and place.

It is towards the end of the nineteenth century – due to the activity of some famous scholars who were aware of the necessity of having a unitary language; due to their efforts of creating a standard language based on the phonetic principle, and their work toward enforcing the use of the Latin alphabet instead of the Cyrillic alphabet – that we can speak about a unitary literary Romanian, whose rules were finally established in academic works.

What gave precedence to the Wallachian variant was the great number of printed editions, both religious and secular, its stable character, with few regional peculiarities that did not differentiate greatly between the spoken and the written language, as was the case in Moldavia or Transylvania. *Three of the most striking regional phonetisms – rotacism, the palatalization of the dental consonants and the palatalization of labial consonants – are rejected by the numerous books printed in Wallachia and Transilvania* (Coteanu, 1961:38).

The Wallachian variant resembles today's literary language and consequently, if the Romanian literary language did not preserve rotacism, the **dz**-type pronunciation (dzece), ǧ (gioc) instead of **j** (joc), and ń (cuń) it was because the Wallachian variant did not have these forms (Coteanu, 1961: 41).

An analysis of the most important elements of the phonological system reveals that the literary language preserved only the seven vowels that occur in the Wallachian variant, while Moldavian and Transylvanian have, even today, a larger vowel system with several types of vowels.

As to the consonants, some phonemes characteristic of all variants were rejected by the literary language:

- *dz* for *z*; ǧ for *j*; *j* for *ǧ* (*fuge* instead of *fuje*); *n* (*cui* instead of *cuń*); ś for *č* (*ceapă* instead of *śapă*); palatalized dental consonants or labial consonants; the hard realization of *s, j, d, t* when before an anterior vowel; the palatalization of *s, j* when before a posterior vowel.

The developments in the fields of science and culture, as well as the socio-political environment of the period to come after the unification of the Romanian literary language will lead to its everlasting growth and enrichment, which will enable the most wonderful ways of human expression.

REFERENCES

Coteanu, I. (1961). *Romîna literară şi problemele ei principale.* Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică.

Ghetie, I. (1975). *Baza dialectală a limbii Române.* Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romanian.

Ivănescu, G. (1948). *Probleme capitale ale vechii romîne literare,* Iaşi.

Ivănescu, G. (1980). *Istoria Limbii Române,* Iaşi.

Munteanu, Şt., Ţara, V. (1978). *Istoria limbii Române Literare.* Bucureşti: Editura Didactica şi Pedagogica.

Rosetti, Al., Cazacu, B., Onu, Liviu (1971). *Istoria Limbii Romîne Literare,* vol. I, *De la origini până la începutul secolului al XIX-lea,* Bucureşti: Editura Minerva.

Vasiliu, E. (1965). *Fonologia limbii romāne.* Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifica.

Camelia Firica
Sveučilište Spiru Haret, Craiova
Rumunjska

RAZVOJ RUMUNJSKOGA KNJIŽEVNOG JEZIKA – FONETSKI I FONOLOŠKI ASPEKTI

SAŽETAK

Počeci rumunjskoga književnog jezika mogu se datirati u 16. stoljeće, vrijeme najstarijih poznatih tekstova na književnom rumunjskom.

Mnogo je rasprave o dijalektalnim temeljima književnog rumunjskog, budući da su stručnjaci oblikovali nekoliko različitih stajališta. Jedni podržavaju stajalište da je valahijski idiom temelj književnog rumunjskog jezika. Neki uzimaju u obzir doprinos svih dakorumunjskih idioma u formiranju književnog jezika, dok ostali podržavaju teoriju prema kojoj se do kraja 19. stoljeća ne može govoriti o jedinstvenom književnom jeziku, već o nekoliko književnih varijanti od kojih je svaka temeljena na pripadajućem regionalnom dakorumunjskom subdijalektu.

Proces unifikacije rumunjskih književnih varijanti počeo je nakon 1780. s pojavom prvih tiskanih gramatika te je nastavljen u 19. stoljeću nastojanjem najistaknutijih rumunjskih učenjaka. U svom nastojanju da standardiziraju moderni književni jezik, ti su se učenjaci vodili kriterijima Petrua Maiora i Heliade Rădulescu: latinskom gramatikom, zemljopisnim položajem i kriterijem milozvučnosti. Upravo je valahijska književna varijanta zadovoljavala te kriterije, osobito one fonetske. Ostale su književne varijante također pridonijele oblikovanju i unapređenju jezične strukture, posebno morfologije i vokabulara.

Tijekom svog razvoja, rumunjski je prošao nekoliko fonetskih, fonoloških, morfoloških i leksičkih promjena. Članak se bavi fonetskim i fonološkim karakteristikama i razvojem rumunjskog književnog jezika od prvih tiskanih tekstova do modernog razdoblja.

Ključne riječi: fonetika, fonologija, povijest jezika, književni jezik, rumunjski jezik