



License applied: [CC-BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

DOI: 10.38173/RST.2023.26.2.13:129-141

Title:	<i>COMPARATIVE-CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF EXPRESSING FACTUALITY AND NON-FACTUALITY IN ROMANIAN AND ENGLISH</i>
Authors:	Laura SASU

Section: Social Sciences

Issue: 2(26)/2023

Received: 9 September 2023	Revised: 6 October 2023
Accepted: 26 October 2023	Available Online: 15 November 2023

Paper available online [HERE](#)

COMPARATIVE-CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF EXPRESSING FACTUALITY AND NON-FACTUALITY IN ROMANIAN AND ENGLISH

Laura SASU¹

ABSTRACT:

THIS ANALYSIS AIMS AT COMPARING AND CONTRASTIVELY INVESTIGATING THE LINGUISTIC PATTERNS USED IN ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN WHEN EXPRESSING FACTUAL, NON-FACTUAL, COUNTER-FACTUAL OR HYPOTHETICAL MEANING. MOOD IS OFTEN THE DIFFERENTIATING CATEGORY APPLIED IN ROMANIAN FOR SUCH SEMANTIC DISTINCTIONS. HOWEVER, IN ENGLISH, NON-FACTUALITY EXPRESSION PERTAINS TO THE AREA OF GRAMMATICAL MARKERS, ASSOCIATED WITH A SEMANTICALLY FALSE FORM OF PAST TENSE. THE SUPERIMPOSITION OF THIS UNREAL PAST UPON NON-FACTUAL FUTURE, PRESENT AND PAST VERB PHRASES RESULTS IN SHIFTING EACH TENSE ON STEP FURTHER INTO THE PAST, AS MEANS OF EXPRESSING NON-FACTUALITY. THEREFORE, THIS SHIFT IS USED TO TRANSLATE CONDITIONS, IN SEVERAL TYPES OF CONDITIONALS, AS A TRANSLATION OPTION FOR THE ROMANIAN "CONDIȚIONAL OPTATIV", BOTH PRESENT AND PERFECT FORMS. THE SAME LINGUISTIC PATTERN IS ALSO USED FOR TRANSLATING PAST SUBJUNCTIVE, NAMELY VARIOUS CONTEXTS, SEMANTICALLY CIRCUMSCRIBED TO NON-FACTUALITY, AS THE TRANSLATION OPTION FOR THE ROMANIAN MOOD CONJUNCTIV PREZENT AND CONJUNCTIV PERFECT. THE PAST TENSE FORM IS MERELY FORMAL, USED AS LINGUISTIC MARKER FOR SEMANTIC NON-FACTUALITY, BEING THUS A UNREAL PAST IN SUCH CONTEXTS. TRANSLATION ERRORS OFTEN OCCUR IN RENDERING NON-FACTUAL MESSAGES FROM SOURCE INTO TARGET LANGUAGE WITHIN THIS PARTICULAR LANGUAGE PAIR, DUE TO THE EXISTING LACK OF CORRESPONDENCE IN MEANS OF EXPRESSION TYPICAL FOR THE INVESTIGATED SEMANTICAL ASPECT, THAT OF NON-FACTUAL, COUNTER-FACTUAL OR HYPOTHETICAL MEANING.

KEY WORDS: NON-FACTUALITY, CONDITIONALS, SUBJUNCTIVE, UNREAL PAST

INTRODUCTION

Translation, as an inter-linguistic bridge necessary for any intercultural exchange, has always been of great interest for linguists, due to the impact and relevance of the theoretical and applied findings. "As an intercultural means of communication between parties not sharing the same linguistic code, translation has always carried information, discoveries, inventions and findings across the world, having a decisive role in the progress of humanity." [1] Contrastive linguistics, in particular has two language codes facing each other, with the ultimate goal of attaining semantic equivalence. "Equivalence is one of the core

¹ Lecturer PhD, Transilvania University of Braşov, Romania, laura.sasu@gmail.com.

concepts in the theory of Translation Studies.”[2] and the comparative contrastive method used in this applied analysis is one of the most appropriate tools to investigate similarities and divergent points in a particular linguistic aspect, with the ultimate goal of translation equivalence. But, translation equivalence is only possible when the context is also taken into account. And when it comes to context, R.T. Bell clarifies: “What though, is meant by 'context'? Three levels of abstraction can be suggested: the immediate situation of utterance, the context of utterance and the universe of discourse“[3] Thus, it becomes obvious that translation equivalence often depends both on the ability to translate in context and on the ability to view the language codes in contrast“. The translation process needs to adapt to context, to, sometimes, switch to completely different paths or means of expression for attaining a specific semantic equivalence, and for successfully overcoming the big trap of translation: word-for-word translation. Proficient translators must know: “A stress may do here, what a gender change may do elsewhere. To be prepared for collisions we need to know the road. Contrastive Linguistics is the discipline that charts it.“[4] One such example, when it comes to the periphrastic use of will and shall future, is that Ch. Fries “the task of not only determining as fully and accurately as possible the usage of the time and its historical development, but the background of the curious and complex set of rules as well.”[5]

The underlying paper aims at using the comparative contrastive method to analyse and investigate the similarities and differences in expressing factuality versus non-factuality in Romanian and English.

Factuality versus non-factuality is the semantic distinction operated on a linguistic level by language-specific markers. In inter-linguistic transfer situations such as translation from Romanian as the Source Language into English as the Target Language, several translation and equivalence errors emerge, since the existing linguistic patterns used for these two languages are in some respects quite similar, while in others they differ completely.

Therefore, it becomes relevant for identifying exact semantic equivalence and for avoiding grammatical translation errors or semantic shift in translation of such instances to further analytically investigate aspects such as factuality, non-factuality, counter-factuality and hypothetical meaning and the corresponding means of expression in contrast, by comparing the two language codes. Thereafter, a coherent synthesis of semantically corresponding linguistic units can be devised, to serve as support for any possible translation difficulties, when it comes to expressing factuality and non-factuality. Such analyses are necessary for disambiguation, coherence and equivalence in translation studies, an interdisciplinary area with “linkages to other disciplines” [6]. In applied linguistics and translation studies the main objective is to attain the closest semantic equivalence possible, not to produce sequences of linguistic units in another language code, according to purely “formal equivalence”. [7]

1. LINGUISTIC PATTERNS FOR FACTUALITY vs. NON-FACTUALITY IN ROMANIAN

MOD

In Romanian factuality is expressed by means of indicative mood phrasing, having all temporal references, including all verbal tenses, factual meaning in positive, interrogative or negative forms.

1.1. INDICATIV is the tense typically used to express factuality in Romanian.

1.1.1. Present: *Eu scriu acum.*

- 1.1.2. Imperfect: *Eu scriam cand m-ai sunat.*
- 1.1.3. Perfect compus: *Eu am scris tot.*
- 1.1.4. Perfect simplu: *Eu scrisei aici.*
- 1.1.5. Mai mult ca perfectul: *Eu scrisesem deja raspunsul.*
- 1.1.6. Viitor: *Voi scrie mai tarziu.*
- 1.1.7. Viitor anterior: *Pana atunci eu voi fi scris totul singur.*

1.2. **IMPERATIV** is used to express orders, commands usually limited by its inherent meaning to 2nd person singular and plural:

2nd person singular: *Scrie!*

2nd person plural: *Scrieti!*

However, for 1st person plural, inherently including 2nd person singular or plural (you) and 1st person singular or plural (me/us) the conjunction *Să* is used, in a construction similar, or identical to that used in *conjunctiv*.

1st person plural: *Să mergem!*

1.3. **CONJUNCTIV** is the mood used to express modality (volition, willingness, obligation, prohibition, intention, probability etc.) in combination with a counterpart of the English semi-auxiliary modal verb.

Conjunctiv present: ...să scriu...

Conjunctiv perfect: ...să fi scris...

1.4. **CONDITIONAL OPTATIV** is the mood used to express conditions and preferences.

Conditional-optativ prezent:...aș scrie...

Conditional-optativ perfect:...aș fi scris...

2. LINGUISTIC PATTERNS FOR FACTUALITY vs. NON-FACTUALITY IN ENGLISH

MOOD

In English semantic distinction between factuality and non-factuality or assertion and non-assertion, defined as either virtual, non-real, hypothetical or counter-factual meaning, is also linguistically marked by specific use of mood categories that pertain to the realm of factuality versus (indicative) mood categories that indicate lack of factuality (subjunctive).

2.1. INDICATIVE

The 12 TENSES of the indicative mood are linguistically marked for objective time, person, number of actions expressed as factual assertions, or negations or interrogatives about factuality, have all temporal references. Finite and non-finite forms and auxiliaries occur in verb-phrases coined as set conventional constructions rendering information about time, person and number such as: *is, was, are, were, have, had, will, writes, wrote, written, writing.*

- 2.1.1. Present Simple: *I usually write.*
- 2.1.2. Present Continuous: *I am writing right now.*
- 2.1.3. Present Perfect: *I have already written the article.*
- 2.1.4. Present Perfect Continuous: *I have been writing for years.*
- 2.1.5. Past Simple: *Yesterday I wrote a lot. (REAL FACTUAL PAST)*
- 2.1.6. Past Continuous: *When you called I was writing.*
- 2.1.7. Past Perfect: *I had written the entire translation by 6 yesterday.*
- 2.1.8. Past Perfect Continuous: *I had been writing for a while, when I decided to take a little break.*
- 2.1.9. Future Simple: *I will write that novel.*
- 2.1.10. Future Continuous: *I will be writing tomorrow afternoon, so don't call.*
- 2.1.11. Future Perfect: *I will have written everything by then.*
- 2.1.12. Future Perfect Continuous: *I'll have been writing for several hours when you return from work.*

2.2. IMPERATIVE – orders and commands are expressed using the short infinitive form of the verb, and usually refer to 2nd person singular and plural.

2nd person singular: *Write!*

2nd person plural: *Write!*

Identity in form is due to the fact that short infinitives (v1) do not entail number distinction.

But, for the first person plural (us) including both (you) 2nd person singular or plural and (me or us) the phrasing has a different form using the verb *let* as a semi-auxiliary preceding the short infinitive of the lexical verb.

1st person plural: *Let's (us) go!*

The use of *let* in various other contexts, such as *as let there be light* or *let it rain* are also translated into Romanian using the conjunction *SĂ* (*să se facă lumina, să plouă*) in a phrase identical in form to that used for non-factuality in *conjunctiv*.

2.3. SUBJUNCTIVE

SUBJUNCTIVE is the mood coined as a linguistic marker used for expressing semantic non-factuality. Subjunctive, just like its Romanian counterpart – the *conjunctiv* - also occurs in subordinate clauses and implies non-factuality of the lexical verb, that is used in an odd form, as the linguistic marker of non-factuality.

They insisted that he take the bus.

Here, the lexical verb in the subordinate is used in the V1 short infinitive form, an unexpected phrasing since it lacks the 3rd person singular *VB+s* expected for a present simple indicative common factual assertion: ...*that he takes the bus*. This is the conventional maker for non-factuality of the action expressed by the lexical verb in this case, since the preceding *he*

insisted that... is the introductory phrase for semantic non-factuality of the action expressed by the verb in the subordinate.

2.3.1. PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE

Also known as the **SYNTHETICAL SUBJUNCTIVE** according to some grammarians refers to phrases using short infinitive forms, perceived as deviant from the norm of subject – verb concord. It is exactly this exceptional use, the conventional deviation from a grammatical norm, that has the capacity of subtly implying a possibly divergent inherent meaning:

MANDATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE:

The mandative subjunctive occurs in that – clauses, it is characterised by the lack of concord between the verb phrase and the subject, whereas the verb is used in *short infinitive*, not in present simple. It is used after lexical verbs expressing demands, requests etc. *such as, demand, request, insist, suggest, ask...etc.*

The parliament voted that the law be maintained in its current form.

X a solicitat ca X să se întâmple.

FORMULAIC SUBJUNCTIVE

The formulaic subjunctive is used in archaic, fossilised expressions, lacking the main clause, which is, however, implicit. (*I wish that* is the inherent meaning of the missing main clause, that remains unexpressed)

Heaven forbid! So be it! Come what may! Suffice it to say! Far be it from me,! God bless you! Long live the Queen! etc.

Ferească Cerul!, Fie!, Fie ce-o fi! Suficient fie spus! Departe fie de mine! Dumnezeu să te binecuvânteze! Trăiască Regina!

Since it is a construction elliptical of main clause (*I wish that*), it is not obvious that in this case the *short infinitive* replacing the present simple is still a marker of non-factuality of the lexical verb, since implicitly it is not a fact but, still a mere wish, even if not introduced as such by the main clause.

2.3.2. PAST SUBJUNCTIVE AND PAST PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE

The Past subjunctive and the past perfect subjunctive are forms used to indicate factual remoteness. They occur after *unless, suppose, it's time, it's high time, wish, had rather etc.*

I wish I had a dog. Îmi doresc să am un câine. No past time reference. Non-Factuality. Unreal Past, where the V2 form of the lexical verb that occurs after phrases such as *I wish* as a marker of non-factuality of a present or future action. The V2 is rather a false past time reference which is sometimes misinterpreted as a past action, due to the form identical to the indicative mood - past simple tense, while it is actually a marker of non-factuality of a present or future event.

The Romanian correspondent is the *conjunctiv present*:

Îmi doresc să am un câine. (acum sau în viitor).

Îmi doresc ca X să se întâmple.

I wish I had had a dog, when I was a child. Past time reference. Non-factuality marker V2 superimposed upon past time reference results in phrases using past perfect for the lexical verb after phrases such as *I wish*. The use of past perfect here is used for a non-factual activity in the past.

The Romanian correspondent is *conjunctiv perfect*:

Îmi doresc să fi avut un câine. (când eram copil).

Îmi doresc ca X să se fi întâmplat.

2.3.3. Subjunctive Equivalent

Subjunctive equivalents using modal verbs followed by infinitives are known as **ANALYTICAL** forms of **SUBJUNCTIVE**. These are less formal, modern forms used in contemporary British English, bearing the same semantic implications, but using different markers for non-factuality.

a) Should + infinitive - informal use, instead of the mandative subjunctive.

He demanded that John (be set free)/ should be set free.

El a cerut ca John să fie eliberat.

b) Would + infinitive - colloquial after **wish**.

I wish you (behaved)/ would behave yourself.

Îmi doresc să te comporți frumos.

c) May + infinitive - alternative to formulaic subjunctive.

May the best win/ (Win the best).

Fie ca cel mai bun să câștige.

d) Might + infinitive – is more remote, more tentative than may.

I hope you might be right.

Sper să ai dreptate.

e) Infinitive construction:

We'll keep close lest we should get lost/ not to get lost.

Von ține aproape ca să nu ne rătăcim.

Suppose the distance (were 1 km)/to be 1 km.

Să presupunem că distanța ar fi de 1 km.

Constructions following *if, if only, as if, as though* are semantically in the realm of the virtual, of the hypothetical, the non-factual or the counter-factual, and therefore such constructions equally imply the use past subjunctive as a marker of the aforesaid non-factual semantic nuances. However, in Romanian the linguistic marker for these cases is a different one. Here, non-factuality is no longer expressed by the use of the *conjunctiv* mood (present of perfect forms), but the mood *conditional-optativ* is used instead (both present and perfect forms, depending on the temporal aspect). Hence, the English marker remains the same shift into the past, whereas in Romanian conditions are expressed using a specific mood, the *conditional-optativ*.

If I knew the answer, I would tell you so. (improbable)
Dacă aș ști răspunsul, ți-aș spune.

If only I had a dog. (unreal)
Măcar de-aș avea un câine.

He acts as if he knew the answer already. (improbable)
He walked as though he had a serious injury. (doubt)

2.4. CONDITIONAL SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

Conditional meaning is often inferred by a bipolar construction, consisting in a main clause stating the consequence, the effect of a condition expressed within a conditional subordinate. In Romanian the same form of *conditional-optativ* is used in both the main clause and in the subordinate:

Dacă aș ști, ți-aș spune.

In English, the same markers of non-factuality referred here as a shift into the past of the corresponding verb-phrase produce different phrasing in the main clause, as opposed to that to be used in the conditional subordinate.

If I knew, I would tell you.

This is the first major difference in non-factuality markers between the two languages investigated here, namely the phrasing is different in English conditional subordinates from that in the main clause, whereas in Romanian both verbs use the same form. This is one of the reasons why, predictably many translation errors occur in such instances, since source and target language use completely different patterns to express non-factuality in conditions.

Type 0:

The only exception in English, where both subordinate and main clause use the same phrasing is the case of conditionals rather expressing generic truth cause-effect relation of two events:

Dacă cineva bea otravă, moare.
Dacă X se întâmplă, Y se întâmplă.
Dacă X prezent, Y prezent.

If someone drinks poison, they die.
If X happens, Y happens.
If X present, Y present.

In this exceptional case, both verbs are in present simple indicative, indicating that it is a form of generic truth, a permanently valid cause effect relation between the actions expressed in the main clause and those in the conditional subordinate. Therefore, these cases

are labelled as false conditionals by some linguists, or at most set aside in a different subcategory of conditionals: Type zero conditionals.

The non-factuality in this case is questionable, since the meaning is that of generic truth cause-effect, that can be verified by substituting *if* with *whenever*: *Whenever someone drink poison, they die*.

The remaining types of conditional categories are expressed differently, namely the type of verb phrase used in the main clause is not identical to that used in the conditional subordinate in English. Even though both parts can be seen as bearing the same linguistic marker of non-factuality, the shift into the past of the verb-phrase, errors often occur when translating from Romanian into English, due to the completely different phrasing in the main clause and the conditional.

The three main subtypes of conditionals are used to differentiate real, hypothetical and unreal conditions. The degree of factual remoteness increases from type 1 to type 2 to type 3, and hence the corresponding linguistic markers shift the verb-phrases one step further into the past: from Future-one step back to the Present, from Present – one step back to the Past and, finally, from Past - one step back to the Past Perfect. On the other hand, the same transformations occur in the main clauses, where in Type 1 there is the use of Future, Type 2 shifts into Future in the Past, and Type 3 to Future Perfect in the Past.

Type 1 (real)

Dacă vei scrie scrisoarea de mână, ea va vedea scrisul tău frumos.

Dacă X se va întâmpla, Y se va întâmpla.

Dacă X viitor, Y viitor.

If you write the letter, she will see your beautiful handwriting

If X happens, Y will happen.

If X present, Y future.

Type 2 (hypothetical)

Dacă ai scrie scrisoarea, ea ar vedea scrisul tău frumos.

Dacă X s-ar întâmpla, Y s-ar întâmpla.

Dacă X conditional-optativ prezent, Y conditional-optativ prezent.

If you wrote the letter, she would see your beautiful handwriting.

If X happened, Y would happen.

If X past, Y future in the past.

Type 3 (unreal)

Dacă ai fi scris scrisoarea, ea ar fi văzut, scrisul tău frumos.

Dacă X s-ar fi întâmplat, Y s-ar fi întâmplat.

Dacă X conditional-optativ perfect, Y conditional-optativ perfect.

If you had written the letter, she would have seen your beautiful handwriting.

If X had happened, Y would have happened.

If X past perfect, Y future perfect in the past.

There are, however, several exceptions, that expand this threefold categorisation of conditionals in English and need to be further investigated:

Colloquial use of Romanian *Imperfect* in both the main clause and the conditional subordinate, is formally similar to the English hypothetical conditional (referred to above as Type 2) at least in the verb phrase used in the subordinate.

Dacă îmi spuneai, stiam răspunsul.

Dacă X se întâmpla, Y se întâmpla.

Dacă imperfect, Y imperfect.

However, this form is erroneously associated with a hypothetical conditional type 2 in English translation and using Past Simple for the verb phrase in the subordinate.

If you told me, I would know the answer. (Type 2)

This translation option is a formally correct phrasing in English, but the meaning in Romanian is not hypothetical: it is rather an unreal condition, that is Type 3. Therefore, the correct translation is either using the pattern in Type 3 or that in a Mixed Conditional:

The actual meaning of the *Imperfect* here, is a colloquial substitute for the *Mai mult ca perfectul*.

Dacă mi-ai fi spus, aş şti răspunsul (acum).

Dacă mi-ai fi spus, aş fi ştiut răspunsul (atunci).

If you had told me, I would know the answer (now).

If you had told me, I would have known (then).

Mixed Conditionals

Another exception to the generic threefold pattern of English conditionals, is, as seen in the example above, the semantic shift in the main clause from a past time reference of the conditioned consequence, to the present time reference in the main clause, thus differentiating Type 3 from Mixed conditionals. Here, in Mixed Conditionals the condition is expressed according to the pattern in Type 3, but is then mixed with the main clause, with a present time reference that implies using the pattern in Type 2.

Dacă aş fi studiat mai temeinic în liceu, aş şti răspunsul la această întrebare (acum).

Dacă X s-ar fi întâmplat (atunci), Ys-ar întâmpla (acum).

If I had studied harder in high school, I would know the answer to this question (now).

If X had happened (then), Y would happen (now).

This is an example of the Mixed Conditional, namely mixed Type 3 + Type 2. The mixed conditional is used when the two time references of the verbs in the conditional and the main clause do not coincide. That implies that the unreal condition in the past has an unreal

consequence in the present. This is different from the semantic implication of Type 3 where the time reference in the main clause, that is, the time reference of the verb expressing the consequence of the unreal condition is identical to that of unreal the condition (past).

Dacă aş fi studiat mai temeinic în liceu (atunci), aş fi ştiut răspunsul la această întrebare (atunci).

Dacă X s-ar fi întâmplat (atunci), Ys-ar fi întâmplat (atunci).

If I had studied harder in high school (then), I would have known the answer to this question (then).

If X had happened (then), Y would have happened (then).

Modal Semi-Auxiliary Verbs in Conditional Subordinates

Exceptional use of will/would/shall/should in conditionals is permitted when these verbs are not auxiliary verbs for future tenses, but only when they are used as modal semi-auxiliaries, thus changing the semantic content from temporality to modality.

If she will not return the dictionary she will be fined.

Dacă ea nu va vrea să înapoieze dicţionarul, va fi amendată.

Here, *will* is not an auxiliary verb expressing future, here *will* is a modal semi-auxiliary verb expressing willingness, and is to be translated as such: *nu vrea să înapoieze*, (voinţă, a vrea) instead of *nu va înapoia* (viitor). If there was a future meaning, it should have been expressed using Type 1 conditional in English:

If she doesn't return the dictionary, she will be fined.

Since this is not the case, and the verb *will* is used in the conditional, it is to be interpreted as a modal verb and the corresponding modality should be included in the translation. The same situation is in the following examples:

If she will not marry me, I will be upset. (modality– willingness)

Dacă nu vrea să se căsătorească cu mine, voi fi trist.

Should the dog bark, I would be very surprised. (modality – improbability)

Dacă ar fi să latre câinele, aş fi foarte surprins.

In this case the modal *should* is used in an unIntroduced conditional, the introductory *if*, or any other synonym (*in case* etc.) is missing. There is a subject - auxiliary verb inversion that signals a different meaning than the common assertive phrasing (*The dog should bark...*), and this possibility also exists for Type 3 conditionals.

Otherwise, any situation where *will*, *would*, *shall* *should* are used in conditional subordinates they are mere translation errors or colloquial forms only accepted in informal style.

Unintroduced Conditional Subordinates:

Had I known the answer, I would have told you.

Dacă aș fi știut răspunsul, ți-aș fi spus.

The Romanian translations implies the use of the introductory *dacă*, or a similar unIntroduced conditional meaning inferred, however, from completely different construction - a *conjunctiv perfect* construction.

Să fi știut răspunsul, ți-aș fi spus.

3. CONCLUSION

Applied linguistics, especially the branch of contrastive linguistics, founded in the past century by dedicated linguists such as Charles Fries (1945) or Robert Lado (1957) and continued by more recent theoretical input from Anthony Pym's (2010), for example, were applied in the underlying analysis, aiming at a more detailed outlook on the way correct expression of factuality and non-factuality can be achieved in translations between Romanian and English, regardless of directionality.

The comparative contrastive analysis of various means of expressing factuality and non-factuality, hypothetical meaning or unreal conditions in Romanian and English can be summarised as a table for a more synthetic image. The different ways of expressing non-factuality in conditional subordinates and the various forms of subjunctive are more clearly visible when contrasted as follows:

Mod	Mood
Română	English
Indicativ	Indicative
Imperativ	Imperative
Conjunctiv	Subjunctive
Condițional-optativ	Conditionals

Table 1 Correspondence table Romanian-English

Non -factuality	
Română	English
X a solicitat ca Y să se întâmple.	X demanded/insisted/requested etc. that Y happen.
<i>Ferească Dumnezeu!</i> <i>Traiască Regele!</i> <i>Fie!</i>	God Forbid! Long live The King! So be it!
Îmi doresc X să se întâmple. Îmi doresc X să se fi întâmplat.	I wish X happened. I wish X had happened.

Dacă X se întâmplă, Y se întâmplă.	If X happens, Y happens.
Dacă X se va întâmpla, Y se va întâmpla.	If X happens, Y will happen.
Dacă X s-ar întâmpla, Y s-ar întâmpla.	If X happened, Y would happen.
Dacă X s-ar fi întâmplat, Y s-ar fi întâmplat	If X had happened, Y would have happened.
Dacă X se întâmpla, Y se întâmpla.	If X happened, Y would happen. If X had happened, Y would have happened.
Dacă X s-ar fi întâmplat (atunci), Y s-ar întâmpla (acum).	If X had happened (then), Y would happen (now).
Dacă X (modal) se va întâmpla, Y se va întâmpla. Dacă X (modal) s-ar întâmpla, Y s-ar întâmpla. Dacă X (modal) s-ar fi întâmplat, s-ar fi întâmplat.	If X (modal) happens, Y will happen. If X (modal) s-ar întâmpla, Y s-ar întâmpla. If X (modal) happen, Y would happen. If X (modal) have happened, Y would have happened.
Să fi X, atunci S-ar fi întâmplat Y. / Dacă X s-ar fi întâmplat, Y s-ar fi întâmplat	Had X happened, Y would have happened.

Table 1 Non-factuality in Subjunctive and Conditionals in Romanian and English

REFERENCES

- [1] Arhire, Mona, *Corpus-based Translation for Research, Practice and Training*. Iași: Institutul European, 2014, p. 33
- [2] Arhire, Mona, *Structural Equivalence in Translation. An introduction*. Vol I Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2016, p.14
- [3] Bell, Robert T., *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Longman, 1991; p. 110
- [4] Di Pietro, R.J., *Language Structures in Contrast*, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1971, p.185
- [5] Fries, Charles C., *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945, p. 205
- [6] Hatim, B. *Communication across Cultures. Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*, University of Exeter Press, 1997, p.80
- [7] Pym, Anthony, *Exploring translation theories*. New York: Routledge, 2010, p.75-76;