

Future formations in Late Latin	1
Balkan Romance: Late Latin	1
The Late Latin future	3
Monolexis	3
Old future. <i>scribam</i>	3
Present tense. <i>scribo</i>	3
Compound constructions. Verbal periphrases	5
1. <i>Habeo</i>	5
2. <i>Debeo</i> auxiliary. <i>debeo scribere</i>	7
3. <i>Volo</i> auxiliary. <i>scribere volo</i>	7
4. <i>Venio</i>	8
5. Other constructions	8
<i>Futurus sum</i> + V[inf.]	9
Conclusion	9
References	10

Future formations in Late Latin

Balkan Romance: Late Latin

The starting point of Balkan Romance is an object of dispute. The problem is that the first Rumanian texts appear as late as in the 16th c, but that Latin and its successors have been spoken on the Balkan Peninsula ever since the 2nd c.

On the one hand, it could be argued that the starting point should be the year of the appearance of the first texts, i.e., 1521 with *Scrisoare lui Neacșu*. On the other hand there is the viewpoint that we can take the outset in Latin.

The former viewpoint is a consequence of the fact that nothing distinctively Romance in the Balkans is written until that time. There is no coverage of Balkan Romance texts from the Middle Ages. Although densely populated with Rumanians under Rumanian speaking rulers, the principalities in Wallachia and Moldavia were not producing any texts in Rumanian until 1521. The texts produced were in the administrative languages — Slavic (principally Bulgarian, possibly Serbian), as well as Greek and Turkish. When so little is known, one might just as well use 1521 as a *terminus ante quem* of the existence of Rumanian as a language.

The latter viewpoint — the outset in Latin — is supported by the fact that there are evidences about the presence of Latin until around 800 AD. “The number of Latin inscriptions in Dacia reach the figure 3,000, whereas the same for all East Romania (Dacia, Moesia Inferior and Superior, Thrace, Dalmatia, Pannonia, Noricum) exceed the impressive number of 21,000,” Frâncu (1997: 15) reports. Latin does not mean the language of the classics, but a language of a subsequent period. I shall take the viewpoint of a 200-800 cc. start with the below argumentation:

The Romans concluded their conquest of the central and eastern parts of the peninsula in the 2nd c. AD. Dacia itself was made a province of the Roman Empire in 106 and abandoned again in 274. In the intermediary period, around 60,000 soldiers and veterans from different parts of the Empire (especially from present Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Austria, as well as from Asia Minor) settled on the left banks of the Danube along with merchants who had been trading there in the preceding centuries, all bringing Latin with them. The romanisation was slow in the beginning, but accelerated towards the end of the Roman presence in Dacia, as exemplified by the Roman citizenship, which was extended to Dacians in 271. Even after the abandonment (due to Hunnish pressure), it must be assumed that Latin was continuously spoken in Dacia. After all, five generations had already been living under the Romans and acquired Latin as a second or first language. Christianity was also linking the Dacians to the Roman world due to the baptising campaigns in the 4th till 5th cc. Moreover, Dacia was re-settled by a large bulk of sub-Danubian Romans, the descendants of the once retiring colonists, in the 6th cc., when Emperor Justinian (527-565) made his incursions there.

It is important to emphasise that Balkan Romance did not take its form in Dacia only. The south and west of the Danube, i.e., adjacent areas in modern Bulgaria and Serbia, were also the location of the glottogenesis (Densusianu (1977: 203)). In fact, Latin asserted itself as the main administrative and inter-ethnic language (*lingua franca*) to the north of the Jireček line (Elbasan — Skopje — Sofia — Varna), with Greek taking the lead to the south of the line. The northern parts of Rumania — Transsilvania and Moldavia — were “romanised” later, this is, after 253 AD.

The newcomers to Dacia were not speakers of the language from Classical Rome. Rather, the conquerors carried a language which was soon to pass from Post-Classic Latin into Late Latin (by some also called Vulgar Latin¹). Late Latin was spoken in western and northern parts of the Empire from around 200 till *ca.* 800 AD, when the first linguistically distinguishable Romance texts (in Old French) made their appearance. The Latin of the period probably constituted no linguistic unity. The unity question is a big issue in Romanistics, dividing the scholars into unitarists, advocates of a Late Latin period with a much linguistic homogeneity (A. Meillet, O. Densusianu (1977: 63-65), E. Löfstedt, S. Puşcariu (1976: 174), V. Väänänen (1963), & al.), and the diversity advocates (Karl Sittl, Wölfflin), who in the end of the 19th c. argued that the large extension of the Roman Empire, incorporating heterogeneous ethnica, lead to an early language split. Indeed, there was a dialectal diversification in process by the beginning of the 3rd century, as can be expected of an Empire of that size. The diversity advocate Sittl argues in his *Lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache* that the European Latinity ceased to exist by the loss of the Roman provinces Sardinia and Dacia. “Provincialisms” in Punic African Latin are yet another proof.² Nevertheless, Rumanian scholars maintain that there was a continued contact between the Roman Occident and Orient (East Balkans) (by force of the Roman/Byzantine *reconquista*) until the 6th c., when the Slavic and other migrations interrupted the connections, widened the gap between the Western and Eastern Latinity, and virtually paved the way for the crystallisation of Proto-Rumanian. The pre-Slavic unity of Late Latin was moreover affirmed by Mihăescu, who in his *La langue latine dans le sud-est de l'Europe* looked over the thousands of Latin inscriptions in the eastern Roman provinces; they confirm an amazing linguistic similarity to the western ones [Mihăescu (1978: 320)] (see more about the discussion in Väänänen (1963: 20-26) and Frâncu (1997: 23-24)). In support of the unitarist view, it must be added that until then, the Balkan Latinity, notably in the domain of lexicology, was developing slowly in

¹ Contemporaries also call it a “latin populaire, latin familier ou latin de tous les jours” (Väänänen (1963: 3)). “Vulgar Latin” = *common Latin* was a term rather referring to the vernacular language of its time, or the “low language”, i.e., pertaining to the Roman underclass, than it was diachronic notion. “Vulgar Latin” is therefore a term designed for the sociolinguistic and stylistic situation in Romania through 200-800 AD, and it must be reserved for those purposes. “Imperial Latin” is employed by French scholars (e.g., by Teyssier (1990: 9)) for the period after *circa* 50 BC, when Latin had turned a massive *lingua franca*, a adstratum language to the majority of the population of *Imperium Romanum*. It is inexact due to the relative durability of the Empire.

² The diversity/unity issue reemerged in the 1990'es as exemplified by Dardel (1991)'s research in isoglosses of Late Latin completive propositions. However, he does not go as far as to set up a thesis of a virtual dialectal split.

comparison to the processes in the Occident, especially in Gaul, but it was apparently following much the same path of development (see Löfstedt (1959)). The current view is the unitaristic. I thus conclude that Late Latin was an entity with minor local variations, at least in the beginning of the period. Dealing with Late Latin (200-800 AD) as the starting point of the Balkan Romance chronology is justified here, although it relates to a period that ends as the one set for Greek and Slavic begins.

The Late Latin future

The means of future expressions were monolectic as well as periphrastic. The period was marked by the transition from the synthetic to analytic futures.

Monolexis

Old future. *scribam*

The principal monolectic futures are a continuation of the post-Classic Latin system, operating with the old inherited future applying conjugations of *-a-* and *-e-* stems with the formant *-b-* for vowel stems as in *ama-b-o*, *ama-b-is*, *ama-b-it* “I shall love, you will love, he/she/it will love” as well as conjugations of *-i-* stems (4th conjugation) and consonantal stems where *-a-* alternates with *-e-*, e.g., *reg-a-m*, *reg-e-s*, *reg-e-t*, “I, you, he/she/it will lead”; *capi-a-m*, *capi-e-s*, *capi-e-t* “I, you, he/she/it take”, *scrib-a-m*, *scrib-e-s*, *scrib-e-t* “I, you, he/she/it will write”.

Sed haec omnia facient vobis propter nomen meum

“But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake”

(John 15:20)

Karl Vossler (1960) pointed out in 1925 that there is a lack of unity in the flexion schemes of the future (*amabo* and *delebo* on the one hand, *legam* and *audiam* on the other hand). This was contributing factor to the development in a direction of analogy.³

Present tense. *scribo*

As no surprise to the researcher of Indo-European languages, the old future in Late Latin was also competing with present tense:

Et cum venerit ille, arguet mundum de peccato, et de iustitia, et de iudicio

“And when he is come (= ‘when he will be come’, using the future II), he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement” (John 16:8)

³ As Vossler puts it: “Trotzdem hätte der Formtrieb der Sprache durch analogische Schibungen sehr wohl einen Ausweg finden und Gewiss ein haltbares, einheitliches Futurschema herstellen können, wenn nämlich dem Denktrieb viel daran gelegen war.” [Vossler (1960: 67 ff.)]

apud quem cubitum ponitis

“by whom thou shalt set your elbow (= ‘by whom thou shalt go in to supper’)”

(Petr. 26, 4, in Väänänen (1963: 141))

et pridie kalendas Ianuaris C. noster foras cenat

“the day before January 1, our Caius shall dine out” (ibid.)

As known to other Balkan languages, Balkan Romance also uses present tense for future connotations, often with a temporal adverbial, conf. Rumanian *mîine mergem la cinema* “tomorrow, we(’ll) go to the cinema”.

The monolectic model was unstable in the Late Latin period for several reasons:

1. The 1st person singular was identical in future indicative and present conjunctive, *-am*, of the consonantal stems and *-i-* stems, which could lead to confusion, e.g., *si autem abiero, mittam eum ad vos* “but if I depart (= ‘if I would have departed’, using future II), I will send him unto you”⁴ (John 16:7). This was a heritage from Classical Latin.

2. The paradigms of Latin future II indicative and the perfect subjunctive coincided except for the 1st pers. sing., e.g.,

reg-ere “to lead”

	1st sing.	2nd sing.	3rd sing.	1st plur.	2nd plur.	3rd plur.
Fut. II	<i>rex-er-o</i>	<i>rex-er-i-s</i>	<i>rex-er-i-t</i>	<i>rex-er-i-mus</i>	<i>rex-er-i-tis</i>	<i>rex-er-i-nt</i>
Perf. subj.	<i>rex-er-i-m</i>	<i>rex-er-i-s</i>	<i>rex-er-i-t</i>	<i>rex-er-i-mus</i>	<i>rex-er-i-tis</i>	<i>rex-er-i-nt</i>

Example: *cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit vos omnem veritatem*

“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth” (John 16:13)

This was also heritage from the classical period. Although this does not deal directly with future I, the coincidences of the (active) paradigms of future II and perfect subjunctive, added up with the 1st person coincidence in future I and present conjunctive, do influence the notion of futurity and its expressions.⁵

⁴ Probably in the given example there would be no ambiguity, due to the marking of futurity (in the form of future II) in the conditional clause. As futurity often does occur in relation to conditional clauses, this will have a conservative influence on the development of the futurity system in Late Latin. See, however, reason no. 2 in my argument.

I am very grateful to Ms Nina Bendix, MA in Classical Philology and teacher at Silkeborg Gymnasium, for her kind remarks about this.

⁵ Apart from their ambiguity, they were “*toujours trop peu expressif pour une langue populaire*”, which is another reason that Meillet (1938: 262-263) uses to explain why both forms went out of usage.

3. In the first half of the period, the voiced plosives [d] and [g] in intervowel position opened and turned into voiced aspirates [ḡ] and [ḡ]. The last voiced plosive, the labial [b], was “pulled” into the opening somewhat later, resulting in the bilabial [β] with all the potential of merging with the semivowel [w] (see, e.g., Meillet (1938: 250-252)), which subsequently developed into [v] in non-interconsonantal positions. This led to a crucial confusion around 500 AD as *amabit* “she will love” (future I indicative of vowel stems) and *amavit* “she has loved” (perfect indicative).

4. Add to this that vowel length ceased to be a distinctive feature already in Post-Classical Latin, and that certain vowel mergers took place in the subsequent period, so that what was known in Classical Latin as a short [i] was merging with the long vowel [e:]. This meant that *dices, dicet* “you, he/she/it will say” (future I indicative of consonantal stems) were pronounced as *dicis, dicit* “you, he/she/it are saying” (present ind.).

The numerous coincidences of the old monolectic futures with other verbal paradigms made them highly unstable. From a functional point of view, monolexis became an inappropriate mean to express futurity in Late Latin. Language internal considerations made its speakers look for new ways to relate to posterior events and states; verbal periphrases were a nearby choice.

Compound constructions. Verbal periphrases

There was a multiple choice of periphrases competing with the monolexis. As Väänänen remarks in his *Introduction au Latin Vulgaire*:

“il faut noter en particulier celles qui envisagent le futur comme une chose désirée ou imposée par le destin, à savoir les jonctions d’un infinitif avec des verbes *habeo, debeo, volo* (conf. angl. *I shall sing, he will sing*)” (Väänänen (1963: 141))

Thus there were the forms:

1. *Habeo* auxiliary. *scribere habeo, habeo scribere*

Habeo constructions were a frequent replacement. :

aliter praedicantur, quam evenire habent

“it is predicted otherwise than it will come out (= shall happen)” (Tert. *Scorp.* II, in Väänänen (1963: 141))

Habeo could also carry a valour of obligation as was the case in the classic construction *scribere habeo* “I have to (must) write”, e.g.,

Tempestas illa tollere habet totam paleam

“this storm will lift all glumes”

(Aug. *In evang. Ioh.* 4, 1, 2, in Väänänen (1963: 141))

sanare te habebat Deus per indulgentiam, si fatereris

“God would have cured thee...” (Ps.-Aug. *Serm.* 253, 4, in Väänänen (1963: 141))

In his *Romanische Formenlehre*, Meyer-Lübke (1894: 138) considers the *habeo* periphrase the oldest one. Ovid Densusianu mentions Seneca’s *quid habui facere?* (*Contr.* 1, 1, 19) as the oldest occurrence of the *habeo* + V[+inf.] periphrase, yet “il avait à peu près la valeur de « je dois » (Densusianu (1977: 131)). As a later development, but still quite old, the auxiliary could also be prepositive to (to the left of) the lexical verb, but, as evidenced above, the preferred location of the *habeo* auxiliary was postpositive. Birnbaum (1958: 274) also notes a *habeo ad* + V[inf.]. In the earliest phases of Late Latin, *habeo* futures were in use mainly (ca. 75-80%) with passives (Löfstedt (1933: 70-71)). In her monography *The future in thought and language*, Suzanne Fleischman relates it “to the general decline of passive exponents of passivity (Fleischman (1982: 55)).” On what appears to be based on Romance languages, Meyer-Lübke includes *habeo a cantare*:

“Der vierte noch jüngere Typus is altrumänisch: *are a fi* oder *a fi are*, sardisch: log. *apo a kantare*, campid. *ap a kantai* und vielleicht monferrinisch, wenigstens in Piazza Armerina gebräuchlich [...]” (Meyer-Lübke (1894: 138))

Scribere habeo was the construction that later won the competition in the Occident, conf. Italian *scriverò, cantarò*, French (*je*) *écrivais, chanterais*, Castilian *escriberé, cantaré*. Portuguese has even preserved the location of the pronoun by incorporation, e.g., *nos escrever-lhe-emos* “we shall write him” < *nos scribere ei habemus*, *dar-me-as* “you will give me” < *dare mihi habes*. The inverse construction *habeoscribere* disappeared in most Western Romance dialects through the later Middle Age; Meyer-Lübke (1894: 138) reports that it is alive only in Asturian and vernacular Portuguese. One might also add Rumanian forms *am să scriu, ai să scrii, a să scrie*, etc., with the infinitive replaced by a *să* construction (conjunctive). However, Mihăescu (1978: 233) remarks “Des exemples de *habere* + l’infinitif pour exprimer le futur se rencontrent surtout en Italie et Gaule (...)”.

2. *Debeo* auxiliary. *debeo scribere*

Examples:

oppida in quibus debent ordinari

“the villages in which they shall be installed” (Eugipp. *Vit.* 31, 4, in Väänänen (1963: 141))

si dixero tibi quis te occidere debebit, tu occides illum

“if I tell you who is (going) to kill you, you would kill him” (Hist. Alexandri, in Fleischman (1982: 51))

“Originally obligative, *debeo* with an epistemic (potential or conjectural) meaning dates back to Petronius [Arbiter (d. A.D. c. 66), ET-K],” states Fleischman (1982: 51), thus contradicting Meyer-Lübke (1894: 138) who considers it a late formation. This construction only had a peripheral significance to the status of Romance Languages. It has survived in Sardinian (Logudorese) *depo kantare, dees kantare, deet kantare* “I/you/he shall sing” with *depo, dees, deet* as a true future auxiliary, distinct from the lexical verb *depo, depes, depet*, conf. Meyer-Lübke (1894: 277). Nevertheless, it did extend to Dalmatian: *dare debebit; infere debebit* [Mih.,escu (1978: 233)]. The modern Rumanian correspondent to *debeo*, *a trebui*, does not carry any future meaning, e.g., *treabă să fac* “I must do”.

3. *Volo* auxiliary. *scribere volo, volo scribere*

Meyer-Lübke (1894: 138) considers the volitive auxiliary a later development, but is wrong. It is, however, evidenced in Late Latin texts as well.

iam (Maurae) servire volunt

“now, they (Maurae) will serve” (Corippus *Ioh.* 6, 89, in Väänänen (1963: 141))

Mention is often made of its use in the classics, e.g. in Plautus (conf. Mihăescu (1978: 233)), but it always has a volitional meaning, cf. Cicero’s often quoted passage,

volo tibi commemorare, si forte eadem res tibi dolorem minuere possit

“I wish to remind you, if perchance this thing might lessen your grief”

Only later, it became generalised in place of the future infinitive. It was one of the frequent replacements of the Greek $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ constructions in competition with *incipio* and *-urus*, Fleischman (1982: 51) reports, and adds “this development reaches its peak in the writings of the African poet Corippus, where a temporal future value comes to dominate the source modality. This structure must have been especially prominent in the spoken Latin of the second and third centuries, notably in Dacia, where it gave rise to the Romanian *voiu* future.”

The auxiliary could be placed to the left and the right of the lexical verb (Birnbaum (1957: 274)). *Volo* was competing with *incipio*.

Volo later turned out to be the chief auxiliary in Rumanian, e.g., *voi să scriu, scriu-voi*, and the only future marker in Arumunian and Meglenitic *va scriu* “I shall write”.

4. *Venio* auxiliary. *venio ad scribere*

Albeit harder to detect in Late Latin texts (and not mentioned in Väänänen (1963), thus confirming Meyer-Lübke (1894: 138) that it is comparably recent), the *venio* verb “come” was also in use. Descendants of this form are noted in several West Romance languages, everywhere giving rise to progressive periphrases (see Coşeriu and Bertsch (1976: 124) for an analysis of the periphrase on a cross-Romance level), e.g., Rhaeto-Romance (Obwaldian/Sursilvan, dialects of Engadine, see Meyer-Lübke (1894: 138) *veng a kuntar*, rarer *veng kuntar*, and Italian *venne a finire* “they are going to finish”, literally “they are coming to finish”⁶, and Romansch *venel fa*, Engadine *ven far* “he will do” (Fleischman (1982: 114)). Portuguese *vou escrever*, in the latter language this periphrase preponderates in the vernacular. However, it has not survived in Balkan Romance.

5. Other constructions

There were also constructions of the type *habituri sumus munus = habebimus...* (Petr. 45, 4, in Väänänen (1963: 141)), a frequent one in later periods, as well as *qui baptizandi sunt = qui baptizabuntur*. These should be resorted to special cases of present-for-future as in Greek $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\epsilon\iota + V[\text{part.}]$ and Old Slavic *jes`m./bodo.* + V[part.]. Birnbaum (1957: 274) adds that especially ecclesiastical scriptures, namely the ones stemming from Africa, could use the ingressive auxiliary *incipio* + V[inf.] (as in Celtic and Old Slavic) and *futurus (sum) + V[inf.]*. Both should correspond to Greek $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$. Fleischman (1982: 51) comments “The rarity of *incipio* in later Latin foreshadows its failure to survive in Romance.” Löfstedt also notes the *futurus sum*:

quia ipse est, qui futurus est redimere Israhel

“for even though he is the one, who is willing to (= is about to) redeem Israel” ($\delta\acute{\omicron}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega\omega\ \lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\sigma\acute{\omicron}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \text{I}\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$)

Epist. Avell. 75, 4, in Löfstedt (1933: 64).

cum vero futurus est tradere post transactionem temporis conductor

“when the tenant is willing to (= is about to) transfer (it) after the transaction of the time”

($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\iota$)

Justinian’s Novels 64, 1, in Löfstedt (1933: 64)

Futurus sum + V[inf.] occurs rather late in Late Latin. In itself, *futurus* is a secondary formation of *sum*, whereas *futurus sum* is an even later, a tertiary formation, replacing the old

⁶ *Venio* + V [inf.] may have inspired the neighbouring Dutch periphrase *ik gaa schrijven*, and Scandinavian (here: Danish) *jeg kommer til at skrive*.

future *ero, eris, erit, etc.*⁷ It is used due to its strong emphasis on futurity, obviously inspired by the Greek μέλλω, which it translates, and predominantly in subordinate clauses. All occurrences are rather bookish. This indicates that *futurus sum + V[inf.]* was unlikely to be used outside the written language. Neither *futurus sum* nor *incipio + V[inf.]* have left any traces in the Romance languages, probably due to the loss of the African provinces. They must be considered rather peripheral in both a stylistic and a (linguo-)geographical sense.

Conclusion

The Late Latin situation is strikingly similar to the one in Old Slavic and especially Early Byzantine Koine. Both Late Latin and Early Byzantine Greek are proscriptive languages in which present tense of the indicative can also assume future functions. Common to both languages is also that indicative present tense was not the preferred choice. As far as possible the texts use monolexis based on the inherited future in both languages, but it coincides more or less with the subjunctive in both form and function. In Greek sources, subjunctive for future marking is a very frequent approach, but also with the hazard of mixing the functions of the two categories. Furthermore, Late Latin disposes of a number of periphrastic constructions with approximately the same verbs.

The Greek-Latin parallels in future marking end here. Contrary to Greek, the Late Latin subjunctive present is still distinctively marking unreal and timeless actions and states. A confirmation of this is that the subjunctive continues relatively unaltered in forms and functions in the Western Romance languages. We therefore do not observe the subjunctive “take-over” as in Early Byzantine Koine. The supply of periphrastic forms appears to have been bigger in Latin and rather ought to be compared to the Old Slavic situation with *habeo, volo, and incipio*, whereas *debeo* as an auxiliary is pertains to Late Latin only. Greek μέλλω + V[inf.] is thus rendered by both *volo, incipio, etc.*, most visibly in the African Latinity.

In what is left of the Romance on the Balkan Peninsula, only *volo* and *habeo* have survived. If we imagine a scenario in which Balkan Latin had been in a waterproof isolation from surrounding languages, Balkan Romance might have chosen a combination of monolexis and periphrastics. The periphrases might have been retained as stylistic choices in the periphery of the language use, whereas future tense proper might have been expressed through present indicative (with adverbials of time) and subjunctive, as was more or less the situation in Greek in 800-1000. It is possible that this did take place in the subsequent period until 1513 and that the turn to periphrastic solutions happened later in the non-literary period. It is, however, likelier that the texts did not closely enough reflect the vernacular reality that surrounded the scribes. Many innovations, not the least morphological and syntactic ones, have been possible to “fight back” from the texts provided that the author was sufficiently educated and versed in the classical literature. The sermons of the Church Fathers are, though claiming to be in the

⁷ I am very grateful to Ms Nina Bendix, MA in Classical Philology and teacher at Silkeborg Gymnasium, for her kind remarks about this.

language of the people, not practising this (cf. Löfstedt (1959: 71-72)). When circumscriptions do occur in writ, these have probably been under way in the spoken language for centuries before they appear in the texts.

Other things speak for this as well. The Classical Latin verbal system was full of homonyms due to the phonetic development. With its merger of forms as future I indicative present indicative, future I ind. perfect ind., as well as future II indicative perfect subjunctive, any one of these forms could perish (although not all at once!). In Late Latin texts one encounters future I ind. in places where future II ind. is expected, in other words, future I replaces future II. The resulting monolectic future is homonymous with either present or preterit tenses. This situation was leading not only to the final disappearance of the classical future, but also, due to the (partial) homonymy with the perfect, could contribute to an expansion of an analytic future as a reinterpretation of forms as *cognitum habeo*, *perspectum habeo*, *scriptum habeo*. In this way, the other tenses singled out the old future. Apparently, a verbal system can easier do without a future tense than without present or perfect!

The reorganisation of the old future system onto the new one was probably long-lasting. At least for Western Romania's *habeo + V[inf.]* Löfstedt (1933: 69)'s estimate is the time between 2nd and 7th cc. AD.

Language internal considerations make us conclude that the old future had disappeared everywhere by the end, possibly even as early as around 500 AD, of the Late Latin period (with the *sum* verb as the only possible exception: *ero*, *eris*, etc., continued longer — as *boodoo* "I shall be" is the only monolectic future in Old Slavic — conf. Meyer-Lübke (1894: 360)). Its immediate replacements were, on the one hand, present indicative, and, on the other hand, periphrasis with *habeo*, *debeo* and *volo*. An examination of the Balkanisation of Rumanian and its sister languages must take its start in this situation of analytical models. In other words, the disappearance of the monolectic future in Balkan Romance shall not be analysed as a specifically Balkan phenomenon, but as a result of a general Late Latin development.

References

- Birnbaum, Henrik. 1957. "Zum periphrastischen Futurum im Gotischen und Altkirchenslavischen". In *Byzantinoslavica. International Journal of Byzantine Studies* 18 : 77-81.
- Birnbaum, Henrik. 1958. *Untersuchungen zu den Zukunftsbeschreibungen mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Verbalsyntax des Slavischen.* (=Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Études de philologie slave 6. (Doctor's dissertation)). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Coşeriu, Eugen, and Hansbert Bertsch. 1976. *Das romanische Verbalsystem; Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Hansbert Bertsch.* (=Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 66). Tübingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr · Tübingen.
- Dardel, Robert de. 1991. "Types d'igoglosse en roman commun". In *Actes du XVIIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes ; Université de Trèves (Trier) 1986.* Tome III: Section V: Grammaire diachronique et histoire de la langue; Section VIII: Dialectologie et géographie linguistique; Section XIII: Textes non-littéraires. Edited by Dieter Kremer. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 478-484.

- Densusianu, Ovid. 1977. "Limba română în secolul al XVII-lea". In *Opere; III*. Vol. 3. Edited by Valeriu Rusu. A republishing of the original *Limba română în secolul al XVII-lea* (partea I, 1935—1936, partea a II-a, 1936—1937). București: Editura pentru literatură, 17-184.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1982. *The future in thought and language : diachronic evidence from Romance*. (=Cambridge studies in linguistics, 36). Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 1997. *Geneza limbii și a poporului român*. (=Colecția "Lingua"; 2). Iași: Casa Editorială "Demiurg".
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1933. *Syntactica : Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins ; Zweiter Teil : Syntaktisch-stilistische Gesichtspunkte und Probleme*. (=Acta Regiae Societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis 10: 2). Vol. 2 of 2 vols. Reprinted in 1956. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1959. *Late Latin*. (=Institutet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie A, Forelesninger 25). Oslo (London, Wiesbaden, Paris, Cambridge (Mass.)): Aschehoug.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1938. *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*. Quatrième édition révisée et augmentée. Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1894. *Romanische Formenlehre*. (=Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen). Vol. 2 of 2 vols. 1st ed. Leipzig: Reisland.
- Mihăescu, H. 1978. *La langue latine dans le sud-est de l'Europe*. București · Paris: Editura Academiei · Société d'édition "Les belles lettres".
- Pușcariu, Sextil. 1976. *Limba română. I. Privire generală*. Prefață de G. Istrate; note, bibliografie de Ilie Dan. București: Editura "Minerva".
- Teyssier, Paul. 1990. *História da Língua Portuguesa*. (=Colecção «Nova universidade». Linguística). 2nd ed. (Portuguese). Lisbon: Livraria Sá da Costa Editora.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1963. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. (=Bibliothèque française et romane. Serie A, Manuels et études linguistiques ; 6). 1st ed. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Vossler, Karl. 1960. *Geist und Kultur der Sprache*. (=Wissen der Gegenwart ; Band 13/14). München: Dobbeck Verlag.