8th LUMEN International Scientific Conference Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice | RSACVP 2017 | 6-9 April 2017 | Suceava – Romania

Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice

The Convertor Status of Article of Case and Number in the Romanian Language

Diana-Maria ROMAN*

https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.62

How to cite: Roman, D. M. (2017). The Convertor Status of Article of Case and Number in the Romanian Language. In C. Ignatescu, A. Sandu, & T. Ciulei (eds.), *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice* (pp.682-694). Suceava, Romania: LUMEN Proceedings
https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.62

© The Authors, LUMEN Conference Center & LUMEN Proceedings.
Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

©LUMEN Proceedings

8th LUMEN International Scientific Conference
Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice |
RSACVP 2017 | 6-9 April 2017 | Suceava – Romania

The Convertor Status of Article of Case and Number in the Romanian Language

Diana-Maria ROMAN[1]*

Abstract

This study is the outcome of research on the grammar of the contemporary Romanian language. It proposes a discussion of the marked nominalization of adjectives in Romanian, the analysis being focused on the hypostases of the convertor (nominalizer). Within this area of research, contemporary scholarly treaties have so far accepted solely nominalizers of the determinative article type (definite and indefinite) and nominalizers of the vocative desinence type, in the singular. However, with regard to the marked conversion of an adjective to the large class of nouns, the phenomenon of enclitic articulation does not always also entail the individualization of the nominalized adjective, as an expression of the category of definite determination. What is outlined, thus, is the situation of nominalized adjectives, in the vocative case, always accompanied, to the right, by pronominal possessive adjectives or by a genitive, in the absence of the head noun. As the expression of conversion, the enclitic article at the end of these nominalized adjectives can no longer coincide with the definite determinative article: despite the homonymy, it is an article of case and number nonetheless. Under these circumstances, the Romanian system actualizes the convertor in the nominalization of adjectives depending on the case of the nominalized lexeme: convertors of the desinence type and of the article of case and number type are actualized in the vocative (V), whereas convertors of the determinative article type (definite and indefinite) are actualized in the nominative, accusative, genitive and dative (NAccGD).

Keywords: conversion, convertor (nominalizer), determinative article, article of case and number, article of gender, number and case, nominalization.

[1] PhD., Faculty of Letters, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, deedee5891@yahoo.com.

https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.62
Corresponding Author: Diana-Maria ROMAN
Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

1. Introduction

Undertaking research on the grammar of the contemporary Romanian language, from an exclusively synchronic viewpoint, this study aims to re-launch discussions on the marked conversion of adjectives into nouns[2], by broadening the scope of convertors of the article type.

We believe that our research results become relevant, on the one hand, in the area of Romanian specialized studies, since regardless of the doctrinal orientation of the various schools of grammar, they all acknowledge and discuss, albeit insufficiently, the active phenomenon of the conversion of adjectives into nouns, and on the other hand, in international scholarship, where the Romanian language may be compared with other languages belonging to the same or to different families, highlighting the following features they have in common: the actualization of the grammatical category of determination, the marked conversion of adjectives into nouns through the definite determinative article, the grammatical category of case both in nouns and in adjectives, or the existence of the case member, the vocative.

Thus, by focusing on the common noun and the adjective as flexible parts of speech, this study outlines several directions of research on the Romanian grammatical system, which may foster and launch contrastive lines of inquiry into: the affixation of the definite determinative article, always in an enclitic position, to the phonetic body of the common noun and the adjective, the latter being pre-positioned and marking, in this situation, a positional enclitic articulation; the opposition between the unmarked conversion and the marked conversion of adjectives; the double status of the definite determinative article in the phenomenon of the marked conversion of adjectives, as a converter and as an expression of the grammatical category of determination; the marked and unmarked nominalization of adjectives.

2. Conversion in the Romanian Language

In the Romanian system, the phenomenon of conversion and that of lexical-grammatical derivation are well-known.[3] According to contemporary

[2] Or the nominalization of adjectives. In fact, grammars define conversion based on the actualization of the new lexical-grammatical class, in other words, based on the *finality* or the *product*, and not the other way around, conceptually marking the phenomenon in keeping with the part of speech which is converted; hence, the terms nominalization, adverbialization, etc., see [1 p.143]

[3] Derivation, as a process, comprises two stages: *lexical derivation* vs. *lexical-grammatical*

grammar treatises, the common denominator of the two internal means of enriching the vocabulary consists in the conversion of a word[4] with a certain morphological value in a "primary hypostasis,"[5] "*they do not have in their phonetic bodies – in their roots, any element that might explicitly and unequivocally indicate the fact that they belong to a particular part of speech with its own categorical*[6] *meaning*" [10 p429] [emphasis ours], into another part of speech, as a "converted hypostasis."

Generalizing, regardless of the type of conversion, *marked* vs *unmarked,*[7] the content of the categorical content of the primary word may change to varying degrees at the level of expression, depending on the flectional hypostasis. The following results are possible:

a. The conversion of a flexible part of speech into a nonflexible part of speech[8]may lead to: a.1. the complete loss of the flective: adjective proper → adverb: *băiat frumos* [*nice boy*] → *cântă frumos*[*sings nicely*];

b. *The conversion of a flexible part of speech into another flexible part of speech* may lead to: b.1. the maintenance of the entire flective: adjective → noun:*băiat viteaz* [*valiant boy*] → *acest viteaz* [*this valiant* (*boy*)]; b.2. the maintenance and the addition of a flectional subunit: adjective → noun: *băiat frumos* [*nice boy*] → *un frumos* [*a nice* (*boy*)]; b.3. the substitution of a flectional unit: adjective → noun: *fată frumoasă* [*beautiful girl*] → *frumoasa* [*the beautiful* (*girl*)].

c. The conversion of a nonflexible part of speech into flexible part of speech may lead to: c.1. the acquisition of the flective:[9] interjection → noun: *of* [*oh*] → *oful* [*the oh*] or *of* [*oh*] → *acest of* [*this oh*]; adverb → noun: *danseaz*ă *bine* [*is a good dancer*] → *binele* [*the good*] or *danseaz*ă*bine* [*is a good dancer*] → *acest bine*[*this good*].

From the point of view of the productivity of conversion, it is no longer a novelty that, of all the morphological values recognized by the

---

derivation, see [8]. For other authors, the opposition is between *lexical derivation* and *grammatical derivation*, see [11 p57]. Whatever the name of the former, the lexical-grammatical class does not change.

[4] The phenomenon refers to the word as a general term, without regard to the oppositions *lexeme* vs. *relateme* or *lexeme* vs. *opposeme*. For a brief discussion on the opposition *lexeme*-word vs. *relateme*-word, see [15]. For the opposition *relateme* vs. *opposeme* as the status of prepositions and prepositional phrases, see [13].

[5] For the difference *primary words* vs *derived words*, see [11 p55].

[6] For the trichotomy *lexical meaning* vs *categorical meaning* vs *instrumental meaning*, see [11 p45].

[7] For this opposition, proposed in terms of its actualization means, see [10 p431-436].

[8] When words are classified according to the morphological criterion, we consider that the appropriate terms are *flexible part of speech* vs. *nonflexible part of speech* and not the dichotomy *variable part of speech* vs *invariable part of speech*. See, in this regard, [15].

[9] Only a part of nonflexible part of speech can be in this situation.

system of the Romanian language, the noun is the most likely to "absorb" other parts of speech and, implicitly, the adjective.[10]

Unlike conversion, where the *nominalizer* as a general concept, as a supraordinate class,[11] marks the categorical meaning of words, lexical-grammatical derivation operates through *categorizators*, [11 p56] derivative affixes[12] that are specific to the borrowed morphological value: noun → adjective: *român* [*Romanian*] → *român**esc*** [*Romanian*]**.**[13]

In the latter context, the "adaptation" of the word to the "demands" of the new class occurs by simultaneously conveying two types of information: lexical and categorical. This has led some authors to define the two as interdependent phenomena. [11 p57]

3. The nominalization of adjectives in Romanian

From the large class of adjectival only adjectives proper may be converted into nouns. The others[14] are incompatible, for obvious reasons, because they are already "converted."[15] In fact, the trajectory of a word undergoing a process of grammar value change includes solely two positions, the "primary" one and the "converted" one. In other words, there is a binary rapport of 1 to 1.[16]

Narrowing down the discussion to Romanian adjectives[17] that may be converted into the class of nouns,[18] most contemporary studies limit

[10] The noun "is ready" to nominalize not only words, but also "prefixes and composition elements that acquire autonomy through conversion, letters, more or less extensive blends." As regards *relateme-words* of the preposition and conjunction types, their nominalization is *autonymic*, see [4 p134].

[11] Depending on the conversion type, the *convertor* imposes the trichotomy: *positive convertor* vs. *negative convertor* vs *zero convertor*, for details, see [10 p431-436].

[12] For *derivative affixes*, see [1 p33]

[13] For the *derivative affixes* specific to different parts of speech, known as "*class categorizers*", see [11 p56-57].

[14] The reference is to pronominal and verbal adjectives. Numerals with adjectival value are not included in this discussion, because even if they have this value, they are numerals, in general, so the conversion phenomenon targets the part of the speech itself and not its values: in this case, the two do not coincide. Hence, the previous hesitations of grammarians whether to fix the numeral within certain morphosyntactic limits. Moreover, at the level of expression, numerals take the same form, with insignificant exceptions.

[15] For these reasons, we should avoid *pleonastic expressions* like the following: changing the grammatical value of adjectives proper.

[16] A special situation is the adverbial use of a participle, since this entails the adjectival use of as an intermediate stage; see, in this regard, [9 p249.]

[17] For a discussion regarding the phenomenon of conversion *pronouns* vs *pronominal adjectives*, see [14].

themselves to briefly mentioning the phenomenon in a subchapter devoted to the internal means of enriching the vocabulary [17 p97-98] in chapters dedicated to the adjective and the noun,[19] in chapters that address the article in general,[20] or not at all.[21]

Whatever the degree of interest that grammarians exhibit in the nominalization of adjectives, what can be noted is a visible shortcoming in the conversion from a *primary form* to the *converted form*: the opposition *marked conversion* vs. *unmarked conversion,* specific to this part of speech, is insufficiently used and the comments are too general; hence, the sense that the topic is not comprehensively approached: "*The change of the adjectival value into a nominal value may be carried out through several methods*." [4 p175] [emphasis ours]; "*The marks of nominalization are*: [4 p134] [emphasis ours]

The absence of real motivation in this area of research appears, to some extent, to be natural and explicable: the contexts in which the adjective may be converted into a noun are subject to the syntactical position and the presence of the same parts of speech that either block the appearance of the determinative article in primary common nouns,[22] actualizing unmarked conversion, or force the appearance of the determinative article, actualizing marked conversion.[23]

3.1. The unmarked conversion of adjectives

Generally, the occurrences of nominalized adjectives in the absence of determinative articles, regardless of their type, can be classified as follows:

a. The association with lexemes belonging to the class of those determiners that "cease" the appearance of the determinative article: within these limits, the nominalized adjective may have different subordinated parts of speech from the adjectival class: pre-posed pronominal demonstrative pronominal adjectives: *Aceşti* ***viteji*** *au fost decoraţi.* [*These* ***brave*** *(men)* have been *decorated.*]*;* numerals with adjectival value: *Două* ***blonde*** *prezentau programul.* [*Two* ***blondes*** *presented the program.*]*; Ambele* ***blonde*** *din grupul nostru şi-au depus dosarul pentru concurs.* [*Both* ***blondes*** *in our group have applied for the competition.*] *etc.*

---

[18] For the other situations where the adjective may be "taken over" by another part of speech, see [4 p175-177]

[19] See, for example, [4 p133-139, p175-177].

[20] For example, Chapter 2 – *Eterogenitatea formelor reunite sub denumirea de "articol",* Chapter 3 – *Dificultăţi de recunoaştere, de analizăşi de utilizare a articolului*, in [12 p27-64].

[21] For instance, this topic is absent in [6], in [5].

[22] See, in this regard, [3 p57].

[23] See, in this regard, [3 p90-91]

b. The presence of prepositions/prepositional phrases next to nominalized adjectives[24] in contexts that are specific to nouns: *Era cel mai cunoscut* ***dintre silitori***. [*He was the best known* ***of the diligent*** *(ones)*], *Le-a dat bomboane* ***la plângăcioşi*** [*He gave candy* ***to the cry-babies***.].

c. The occurrence in certain syntactic positions of the predicative type (predicative and additional predicative element),[25] without other types of determinations, which inevitably leads to conflating the boundary between the adjective and the noun: [4 p176] *Ion este* ***muncitor/luptător.*** [*Ion is* ***hard-working/combative***]; *Pe Ion îl consider* ***muncitor/luptător***. [I consider Ion to be ***hard-working/combative***].[26]

3.2. The marked conversion of adjectives

As regards the formal marking of the nominalization of adjectives, the following working coordinates have been advanced so far:

a. The convertor[27] actualizes exclusively two flectional hypostases, namely the *definite determinative article*,[28] *băiat frumos* → ***frumosul*** *acesta* [*handsome boy* → *this* ***handsome*** *(boy)*], and the *indefinite determinative article, băiat frumos* → ***un frumos*** [***a handsome*** *(boy)*], and the vocative desinence, in the singular: *Dă-mi cartea* ***drăguţule****!* [*Give me the book,* ***handsome***]; ***Scumpo****, nu te-am mai văzut de multă vreme!* [***Sweetheart****, long time no see!*]; [4 p134]

b. The presence of the *convertor-determinative article* admits the simultaneous activation of two phenomena in the phonetic body of the nominalized adjective:[29] acquiring a new morphological status for the adjectives in question, marking the change of the categorical content and the actualization of the grammatical category of determination:[30] "*Articulation simultaneously fulfils two functions: the function of a nominal classifier, i.e. of converting the adjective into the class of nouns; the function of individualization, for the newly emerged noun.*" [12 p57] [emphasis ours]

---

[24] For a full discussion of this context, view [10 p289-296].

[25] I have maintained the name of the function from [8].

[26] For the examples provided above, see [3 p227].

[27] The term is taken from [10 p430].

[28] In addition to situations in which, like in the case of common nouns, definite determination is actualized, in the case of nominalized adjectives there appears a new context, this time conditioned by a post-posed prepositional determination: ***nebunul*** *de elev* [*that* ***reckless*** *student*], ***nesătulul*** *de inspector* [*that* ***insatiable*** *inspector*], ***imbecilul*** *de director* [*that* ***nitwit*** *of a director*], ***bietul*** *de tine* [***poor*** *you*] etc. See, in this regard, [12 p57].

[29] Some authors are not of the same opinion, see, in this sense, [7 p57-58].

[30] For some of the situations in which determination as a grammatical category is suspended, see [12 p45.]

3.2.1. The convertor-article of case and number

Do not number pages on the front, as page numbers will be added separately for the preprints.The aspects pertaining to the nominalization of adjectives in the vocative must be subjected to much more rigorous analysis, starting from two assumptions: the firmly declared doubt about the fact that the only type of convertor of this part of the speech is that of the desinence type, the enumeration and exemplification of contexts specific to adjectives, as follows:

(a). "In the literary language, the most common vocative form of adjectives is homonymous with the non-articulated nominative and accusative for all genders and numbers. This form may generally appear either post-posed (*copil* ***iubit****!* [***beloved*** *child!*], *fată* ***frumoasă****!* [***beautiful*** *girl!*], *soare* ***blând****!* [***gentle*** *sun!*], *copii* ***iubiţi****!* [***beloved*** *children!*], *fete* ***frumoase****!*, [***beautiful*** *girls!*], *râuri* ***limpezi****!* [***crystal clear*** *rivers!*]), (***stimat*** *auditoriu!* [***esteemed*** *audience!*], ***iubit*** *coleg!* [***dear*** *colleague!*], ***scumpă*** *soră!* [***precious*** *sister!*], ***iubiţi*** *colaboratori!* [***dear*** *collaborators!*], ***onorate*** *doamne!* [***dear*** *ladies!*])" [4 p148];

(b). "When it is pre-posed,[31] and when it is separated from the noun by a possessive or by a noun in the genitive, the adjective is articulated enclitically: ***scumpul*** *meu soţ!* [*my* ***dear*** *husband!*], ***scumpa*** *noastră bunică!* [*our* ***dear*** *grandmother!*], ***iubiţii*** *mei prieteni!* [*my* ***dear*** *friends!*], ***dragile*** *mele mătuşi!* [*my* ***dear*** *aunts!*], ***scumpele*** *mamei fete!* [*momma's* ***dear*** *girls!*], ***frumoşii*** *tatei băieţi!*[*daddy's* ***handsome*** *boys!*]" [4 p149]] [emphasis ours]; these situations are also acknowledged in older grammar treatises. [17 p221]

First, if in the contexts under (*a.)*, both the noun and the adjective have a non-articulated form, whatever the word order, in the contexts under (*b.)*, so *mandatorily if it is pre-posed and if either a possessive pronominal adjective or a noun in the genitive is interposed,* the form of the adjective will be articulated enclitically.

It should be noted that the vocative does not comply with the general rule of pre-posed adjectives proper.[32] Even if they are placed in front of determined common nouns, if there is no interposed possessive pronominal adjective or another noun in the genitive, the form of adjectives remains non-articulated.

However, if adjectives are pre-posed and the aforementioned parts of speech are interposed, these adjectives will have an enclitically articulated form; hence, the pertinent question: are they determinative articles, in other

[31] With regard to the problem of adjective articulation, authors do not take into account the situation of the vocative; see, in this regard, [12 p56-57].
[32] For details in this sense, see [16].

words, are they the expression of the grammatical category of post-posed noun determination, or do they represent homonyms forms, but with an altogether different role?!

In order to exploit this direction as efficiently as possible, let us compare the following examples: a. (1) ***Scumpul meu fiu*** *nu ne-a mai vizitat de mult timp.* [***My dear son*** *has not visited us in a long time.*]; a. (2*)* ***Scumpul mamei fiu*** *nu ne-a mai sunat de mult timp.* [***Momma's dear son*** *has not called us in a long time.*] *vs.* b. (1) ***Scumpul meu fiu****, de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp?* [***My dear son****, why haven't you visited us lately?*]; b. (2) ***Scumpul mamei fiu,*** *de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp?* [***Momma's dear son****, why haven't you visited us lately?*].[33]

On the basis of these examples, a series of notes may be highlighted, regarding:

A. *Similarities*: morphologically, in both contexts, a. and b., the *lexemes* maintain their classification: a. (1) and b. (1) *scumpul* [*dear*] – adjective proper, *meu* [*my*] – possessive pronominal adjective, *fiu* [*son*] – common noun; a. (2) and b. (2) *scumpul* [*dear*] – adjective proper, *mamei* [*mother*] – common noun, *fiu* [*son*] – common noun.

From the point of view of the word order, in both contexts, a. and b., the adjective proper is pre-posed to the common noun, the pronominal adjective is interposed, in a. (1) and b. (1), the adjective proper is pre-posed to both common nouns, the former common noun is pre-posed to the latter, in a. (2) and b. (2).

B. *Differences*: from the viewpoint of case actualization, in context of a. (1), the *lexemes scumpul* [*dear*]*, meu* [*my*]*, fiu* [*son*], are integrated in the nominative case; in context a. (2), *scumpul* [*dear*] appears in the nominative, *mamei* [*mother*] in the genitive, *fiu* [*son*] in the nominative; in context b. (1), the *lexemes scumpul* [*dear*]*, meu* [*my*]*, fiu* [*son*] are integrated in the vocative case;[34] in context b. (2) *scumpul* [*dear*] appears in the vocative, *mamei* [*mother*] in the genitive, *fiu* [*son*] in the vocative.

By way of immediate comparison, $scumpul_1$ in contexts a. (1) and a. (2) and $scumpul_2$ in contexts b. (1) and b. (2) are lexemes in whose phonetic body are agglutinated the enclitic articles $-l_1$ şi $-l_2$. While $-l_1$ is, clearly, an *anticipative determinative article* conditioned by the pre-positioning of the adjective, marking a *positional determinative articulation*,[35] it is questionable whether $-l_2$ actualizes the same phenomenon.

---

[33] *Catalyzed desinence*; see, in this regard, [10 p273.]

[34] What are of lesser interest are the aspects pertaining to the syntactic categories of the lexemes and the relational differences between the cases: *case 1* vs *case 2*. For more details regarding the distinctions between *case 1* vs *case 2* vs *case 3*, see [2 p95]

[35] For these two concepts, *anticipative article* and *positional articulation*, see [10 p277]

Clearly, $-l_2$ "refers" to a common noun, the one that is post-posed to it, in b. (1) and b. (2), referring to fiu_2. Verification can very easily be made by rearranging the word order and placing the noun fiu_2 in its specific position in the Romanian language: thus, it is pre-posed to the adjective, as the head of the phrase: (1.a.) ***Scumpul*** *meu fiu, de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp* [*My* ***dear*** *son, why haven't you visited us lately?*]; → (1.b.)***Fiul*** *meu scump, de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp?* [*My dear* ***son****, why haven't you visited us lately?*]; (2.a.) ***Scumpul*** *mamei fiu, de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp?* [*Momma's* ***dear*** *son, why haven't you visited us lately?*]; → (2.b.) ***Fiul*** *mamei scump, de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp?* [*Momma's dear* ***son****, why haven't you visited us lately?*]

$Fiul_1$ in (1.b.) and $fiul_2$ in (2.b.) are enclitically articulated, just like the lexeme *scumpul* in b. (1) and b. (2), a phenomenon conditioned, on the one hand, by the presence of the post-posed possessive pronominal adjective: any common noun that has, to its right, such an adjective appears in articulated form,[36] just like any adjective proper that has, to its right, a possessive pronominal adjective appears in articulated form: "Ultimately, the possessive pronominal adjective demands to its left an enclitically articulated word, regardless of whether this is a noun or an adjective." [9 p95] [emphasis ours]; on the other hand, by the presence of the nominal genitive that follows: any enclitically articulated noun may demand, in its immediate proximity, the presence of a genitive: *fata* ***mamei*** [***mother's*** *girl*], *casa* ***oamenilor*** [*the* ***people's*** *house*], *vagonul* ***trenului*** **[***the* ***train's*** *car***]**.

In fact, the articulated form of the common noun *fiul* [*the son*] in (1.b.) and (2.b.) remains the same even if there is no adjective proper, which does not set any restriction in this regard: compare ***Fiul meu****, ce mai faci?* [***My son****, how are you?*] or ***Fiul mamei****, ce mai faci?* [***Momma's son****, how are you?*] with ***Fiul meu*** *scump, ce mai faci?* [***My dear son****, how are you?*] or ***Fiul mamei*** *scump, ce mai faci?* [***Momma's dear son****, how are you?*].

Accordingly, by converting the adjective into the position of a noun, into a nominalized adjective, and by eliminating the noun *fiul* [*the son*], the aforementioned conditionings are maintained, but it should be noted that the articulation occurs in the phonetic body of the converted adjective.

---

[36] At the level of the system, the Romanian language also features exceptions: such are the situations of unblended noun composition designating degrees of kinship; in this situation, possessive pronominal adjectives are conjunctive: ***Soră-sa*** *nu ne-a mai căutat de ceva timp.* [***His sister*** *hasn't called on us for some time now.*]*; Ce mai face* ***taică-său****?* [*How's* ***his father*** *doing?*]. However, in the genitive and the dative, in the feminine gender, the definite determinative article appears agglutinated with the possessive adjective*: I-am dat* ***maică-sii*** *un cadou.*[*I gave* ***his mother*** *a present.*]*; Casa* ***neveste-sii*** *a fost demolată săptămâna trecută.* [***His wife's*** *house was torn down last week*]. See, in this regard, [4 p94.]

By being placed in the vocative, which is known as the case of appellation, "*representing the explicit indication, by the locutor, of the interlocutor* as the recipient of the imperative, assertive or interrogative message," [4 p72] the common nouns *fiul*$_1$ in (1.b.) and *fiul*$_2$ in (2.b.) are released from the opposition of definite determination.

Under pressure from the context, the *–l* from the end of the common noun *fiul* [*the son*], in (1.b.) and (2.b.), can no longer represent the expression of the determinative article, but will have a different morphematic status, just like "*–le* and *–lor* in the vocative are, formally, articles, albeit not from a functional point of view, because they no longer carry out the opposition to the non-articulated word." [18, p85] [emphasis ours]

Removing the primary noun *fiul* [*the son*] from (1.b.) and (2.b.), we get: (1.b.1.) ***Scumpul*** *meu, ce mai faci?* [*My* ***dear****, how are you?*] and (2.b.1.) ***Scumpul*** *mamei, ce mai faci?* [*Momma's* ***dear****, how are you?*].

In these situations, the articulated form belongs to the nominalized adjective in the presence of the determinant of the possessive pronominal adjective or of the noun in the genitive, both located on the right, the *–l* being the clear expression of the marked conversion. Once they occur in the vocative, these nominalized adjectives cannot be integrated into the oppositions of the category of determination, which is why the two *–l*s cannot constitute even here the expression of the determinative article.

Because of the need to identify the demonstrable morphematic category of these two flectional subunits, we will focus upon the classification of Romanian *enclitic articles* based on the role they fulfil: *determinative article* vs *case article* vs. *formative article*.[37] Whereas the latter subtype is specific to other parts than the noun,[38] the *article of case* (and, implicitly, of number)[39] pertains to the inflection of common nouns under certain conditions[40] vs. of proper nouns ending in *-a*, both feminine and masculine*: Maria, Anca, Ioana, Luca.*[41]

[37] For this trichotomic distinction and examples thereof, see [10 p277-279].

[38] This subtype of article appears with the following parts of speech, with certain lexemes, with certain grammatical categories, wherever they are actualized: personal pronouns proper – *dânsul* [*he*], indefinite pronouns – *altul* [*another],* negative pronouns – *niciunul* [*none*], collective cardinal numerals – *ambii* [*both*], ordinal numerals – *primul, dintâiul* [*the first*], prepositions and prepositional phrases – *în jurul, deasupra* [*around, above*].

[39] In the literature, this article is only known as the article of case. Given that syncretism is a specific phenomenon of the Romanian language, the same flectional unit or subunit can actualize more than one grammatical category, depending on the part of speech to which we refer.

[40] For a comprehensive discussion of this materialization, see [16].

[41] Articles of this type are also preserved with proper nouns in the genitive and the dative,

To conclude, let us highlight the problem situations, proposing a solution regarding the morphematic status of the enclitic article from the end of adjectives proper and from the end of nominalized adjectives:

On the one hand, in (1.a.) ***Scumpul*** *meu fiu, de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp?* [*My* ***dear*** *son, why haven't you visited us lately?* and (2.a.) ***Scumpul*** *mamei fiu, de ce nu ne-ai mai vizitat în ultimul timp?* [*Momma's* ***dear*** *son, why haven't you visited us lately?*], hence, in the vocative, by placing the adjective proper in front of the common noun, with an interposed possessive pronominal adjective or another noun in the genitive, what is actualized, in the phonetic body of the adjective proper is a *positional articulation*, expressed through an *anticipative article of gender, number and case.*.

On the other hand, in (1.b.1.) ***Scumpul*** *meu, ce mai faci?* [*My* ***dear****, how are you?*] and in (2.b.1.) ***Scumpul*** *mamei, ce mai faci?* [*Momma's* ***dear****, how are you?*], by converting the adjectives into the class of nouns, following marked conversion they will adapt to the new flexional circumstances, in the sense that they will take over, at the level of the flective, the flectional components that are specific to the new class.

In this way, the *article of case and number* can occur in the flectional structure of the converted adjective, always, in the vocative, pre-posed to a possessive pronominal adjective or to a noun in the genitive, either substituting the desinence, when the flective is monomorphematic, or attaching itself to the desinence, when the flective is bimorphematic.

4. Conclusions

At the level of adjectives proper, the Romanian language actualizes two homonymousforms of the *enclitic article*, which are nonetheless different in terms of usage: the *anticipative determinative article,* as an expression of *a positional determinative articulation,* in the nominative, accusative, genitive and dative (NAccGD), always, when pre-posed to the noun, both in the absence of interpositions and in the presence of an interposed possessive pronominal adjective and of a noun in the genitive; the *anticipative article of case and number,* as the expression of a *positional gender, number and case articulation,* exclusively in the vocative case, mandatorily in the presence of a possessive pronominal adjective or a noun in the genitive, located to the right of the adjective proper.

---

where the flective of the noun becomes bimorphematic, consisting of a flectional subunit of the desinence type and a flectional subunit of the article of case and number type: *Mariei, Ancăi, Lucăi* [*Maria's, Anca's Luca's*].

Generalizing, the flectional typology of the adjective presupposes, in addition the flective of the desinence type, the flective of the definite determinative article type and an article of gender, number and case.

Regarding nominalized adjectives, as an expression of marked conversion, the Romanian system actualizes the convertor depending on the case of the converted lexeme: a convertor of the desinence type and of the article of case and number type exclusively in the vocative, where a pronominal adjective and a noun in the genitive appear to the right, in the absence of a head noun; the convertor of the determinative article type (definite and indefinite) exclusively in the nominative, accusative, genitive and dative (NAccGD).

At the same time, from a morphematic point of view, the common noun and the nominalized adjective operate with the same flectional inventory: desinence, the definite determinative article and the article of case and number.

References

[1] Dicţionar de ştiinţe ale limbii/Dictionary of Language Sciences. Bucureşti: Nemira; 2005.
[2] Draşoveanu DD. Teze şi antiteze în sintaxa limbii române/Theses and Antitheses in the Syntax of the Romanian Language. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium; 1997.
[3] Gramatica de bază a limbii române/The Basic Grammar of the Romanian Language. Bucureşti: Univers Enciclopedic Gold; 2010.
[4] Gramatica limbii române. I. Cuvântul/Romanian Grammar. I. The Word.. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române; 2005.
[5] Iordan R., Robu V. Limba română contemporană/Contemporary Romanian Language. Bucureşti: Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică; 1978.
[6] Irimia. D. Gramatica limbii române/Romanian Grammar. Iaşi: Polirom; 1997.
[7] Lupşan K. Articolul în română şi germană. Articolul hotărât/The Article in Romanian and German. The Definite Article. Timişoara: Editura Universităţii de Vest; 2007.
[8] Neamţu GG. Curs de limbă română contemporană, Sintaxă/A Course on the Contemporary Romanian Language, Syntax. Facultatea de Litere. Cluj Napoca : Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai;. 2005-2006.
[9] Neamţu GG. Teoria şi practica analizei gramaticale. Distincţii şi… distincţii (cu trei seturi de grile rezolvate şi comentate)/The Theory and Practice of Grammatical Analysis. Distinctions and ... Distinctions (with three sets of solved and commented grids). Ediţia a II-a. Piteşti: Paralela 45; 2007. 249, 502.

[10] Neamţu GG. Studii şi articole gramaticale/Grammar Studies and Articles. Cluj-Napoca: Napoca Nova; 2014.
[11] Nica D. Teoria părţilor de vorbire. Cu aplicaţii la adverb/The Theory of the Parts of Speech. With Applications on the Adverb. Iaşi: Junimea; 1988.
[12] Pană Dindelegan G. Elemente de gramatică. Dificultăţi, controverse, noi interpretări/Elements of Grammar. Difficulty, Controversy, New Interpretations. Bucureşti: Humanitas Educational.; 2003.
[13] Roman DM. The Preposition-Opposeme of the Romanian Substantival Non-sT. LUMEN. 2016 Jun. 4. (1): 7-25. Available from http://lumenjournals.com/philosophy-and-humanistic-sciences/wp-content/ uploads/2016/06/LOGOS_Philosophy_iunie_2016_7to25.pdf. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/lumenphs.2016.0401.01.
[14] Roman DM. The materialization and non-materialization of the same members of the specific grammatical categories upon conversion with regards to pronouns vs pronominal adjectives. In: Boldea I, Buda DM, editors. Convergent Discourses. Exploring the Contexts of Communication. Language and Discourse. Târgu-Mureş: Arhipelag XXI Press; 2016. 253-261.
[15] Roman DM. Invariable and/or non-flexible words?!. JRLS. 10/2017: 653-661. Available from: http://www.upm.ro/jrls/JRLS-10/Rls%2010%2088.pdf.
[16] Roman DM. Definite determinative article or other morphemic status?!. JRLS. 10/2017: 642-652. Available from: http://www.upm.ro/jrls/JRLS-10/Rls%2010%2087.pdf.
[17] Sinteze de limba română/Syntheses of the Romanian Language. Ediţia a III-a. Bucureşti: Albatros; 1984.
[18] Zdrenghea M. Limba română contemporană. Morfologia/Contemporary Romanian Language. Morphology. Cluj-Napoca; 1972.