

---

8<sup>th</sup> 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 Flective-Relateme of the Determinative Article Type in the Romanian Language

Diana-Maria ROMAN\*

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.63>

How to cite: Roman, D. M. (2017). The Flective-Relateme of the Determinative Article Type in the Romanian Language. In C. Ignatescu, A. Sandu, & T. Ciulei (eds.), *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice* (pp. 695-708). Suceava, Romania: LUMEN Proceedings

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.63>



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

## The Flective-Relateme of the Determinative Article Type in the Romanian Language

Diana-Maria ROMAN<sup>1\*</sup>

### *Abstract*

*This study represents a research on the grammar of the contemporary Romanian language. It proposes a discussion regarding the identification of the flective-relateme as an expression of the grammatical category of the case (seen as a relational category) of Romanian common nouns with definite and indefinite articles when they occupy a structural position of the part of sentence and syntactic function type, in the absence of prepositions or prepositional phrases. In the Romanian language, the noun, as a Ts, can be subordinated to a Tr only through two subtypes of relateme, which are in a relation of logical disjunction: preposition-relateme vs flective-relateme. A common noun, whether nondetermined or determined (definite or indefinite), may materialize either a monomorphematic flective, in which case the flective-relateme can be of the desinence type or of the definite determinative article type, or a bimorphematic flective. In the latter situation, accepting the phenomenon of syncretism and redundancy in the Romanian language, it becomes clear that common grammatical categories, number and case, are materialized alike in both flectional subunits, making it difficult to delimit the expression unit of the flective-relateme: the desinence or the determinative article. Once we accept the principle of the monosubordination of syntactic functions and the much higher case functionality of the flective of the determinative article type compared to desinence, we may conclude that the determinative article becomes a flective-relateme.*

**Keywords:** grammateme, syncretism, redundancy, relational category, flective, structural position, flective-relateme.

---

<sup>1</sup> PhD., Faculty of Letters, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, deede5891@yahoo.com.

<https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.63>

Corresponding Author: Diana-Maria ROMAN

Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference



## 1. Introduction

Undertaking research on the grammar of the contemporary Romanian language, exclusively along the synchronic axis, this paper aims at analysing the relational status of the flective of the (definite and indefinite) determinative article type, specific to common nouns in a structural position of the part of sentence and syntactic function type, in the absence of prepositions/prepositional phrases.

We believe that our research results become relevant, on the one hand, in the area of Romanian specialized studies, regardless of the doctrinal orientation of the various schools of grammar, 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, having the following common features: the actualization of the grammatical category of determination and of the grammatical category of the case in the flective of the common noun, flectional monomorphematism and bimorphematism.

Thus, the premises this study outlines, by reference to that flexible part of speech, include a few specific directions for the Romanian system, which can motivate and launch relevant contrastive studies: the inventory of the grammatical categories of this morphological value comprises a minimum number of two, number and case, with five members, and a maximum of three, number, case and determination, with two members, definite and indefinite determination; the possibility of the common noun to appear without the determinative article materialized in its flective; the possibility of the common noun to appear with the determinative article materialized in its flective; the annexation of the definite determinative article to the phonetic body of the common noun, always in an enclitic position, the indefinite determinative article, always in a proclitic position; the syncretic materialization of two grammatical categories within the flectional unit of the desinence type; the syncretic and redundant materialization of two grammatical categories, number and case, within each of the flectional subunits, the flective of the desinence type and the flective of the determinative article type, as components of the bimorphematic flective of the common noun; the much higher case functionality of the determinative article in the presence of the flective of the desinence type; there are two, mutually exclusive means of subordinating the common noun in a structural position of the part of sentence and syntactic function type, namely the preposition-relateme and the flective of case-relateme.

## 2. The *grammateme* in the Romanian language, between *relateme* and *opposeme*

Among the representatives of the *Cluj-based School of Neotraditional Relational Grammar*,<sup>2</sup> D.D. Draşoveanu proposed a dichotomy that is well known today: between the *grammateme*, as the bearer or the expression of an exclusively grammatical content, and the *lexeme*,<sup>3</sup> as the bearer or the expression of an exclusively lexical content.

The *grammateme* is established thus as a generic term, covering both the grammatical meaning of words in this situation,<sup>4</sup> also known as connectives,<sup>5</sup> the *word-grammateme*, and that of the flective,<sup>6</sup> the *flective-grammateme*.

Still, from a relational standpoint, by reference to the opposition between the *relational content* and the *nonrelational content* [2 p21-34] of the *grammateme*,<sup>7</sup> two essential subdivisions emerge: the *relateme*, a *grammateme-relateme*, and the *opposeme*, a *grammateme-opposeme*.<sup>8</sup>

Each of these units of expressions may have different actualizations, generating antinomic pairs:

a. Having, as a common denominator, the status of a word (the former pair) vs the status of a flective (the latter pair): a.1. at the word level, the opposition *word-relateme* vs *word-opposeme* becomes functional;<sup>9</sup> a.2. at the level of the flective, the opposition *flective-relateme*<sup>10</sup> vs *flective-opposeme*<sup>11</sup> becomes functional;

<sup>2</sup> For an overview of the birth of this school in Cluj, after the 1960s, see [18].

<sup>3</sup> Regardless of the absence or presence of derivative *affixes*.

<sup>4</sup> For the classification of words from an ontological point of view, see [7].

<sup>5</sup> For the class of connectors in the Romanian language, regardless of the level at which they appear, see [2 p226-243]. At the same time, we must take into account the special status of some of them, that is, pronouns, adjectives, relative or indefinite relative adverbs, which may occur both as lexemes and as *relatemes*.

<sup>6</sup> For the *flective as an expression of grammatical categories*, see [1 p216].

<sup>7</sup> It is the only unit of expression that may appear as that opposition; otherwise, all lexemes are in a nonrelational hypostasis.

<sup>8</sup> For the opposition *relateme* vs. *opposeme*, see [8].

<sup>9</sup> Up to this point, via exclusive reference to the nominal class, only the preposition can manifest itself both as a *relateme* and as an *opposeme*, depending on the syntactical position in which it occurs, see, in this sense, [14].

<sup>10</sup> For a brief discussion, with examples, of the *flective-relateme of the desinenze type* within the Romanian language in the parts of speech in which it may occur, being the only subtype of flective common to all the flexible parts of speech of the Romanian language, see [18].

<sup>11</sup> For the dichotomy *word-lexeme* vs. *word-relateme*, see [17].

b. Having, as a common denominator, the presence of relational meaning (the former pair) vs the absence of relational meaning (the latter pair): b.1. *word-relateme* vs *flective-relateme*; b.2. *word-opposeme* vs *flective-opposeme*.

As a supraordinate concept in relation to the word and the flective, the *relateme* is a linguistic sign endowed with a relational content and a form, which can manifest itself at both the inter-sentence and the intra-sentence levels. [2 p29-34]

Generalizing, for the representatives of the School of Grammar in Cluj, the *relateme* is coincidental, each and every time, with the relation that it generates exclusively between two terms, within one syntagm, and knows two essential hypostases:<sup>12</sup> the *subordinative relateme* or the *subordinative relation* within a *subordinative syntagm* vs. the *coordinative relateme* or the *coordinative relation* within a *coordinative syntagm*.<sup>13</sup>

Limiting the discussion to the subordinative relation and only at the intra-sentence level, we may outline two principles of analysis: the *relateme* manifests itself only in a structural position<sup>14</sup> of the part of sentence and syntactic function type, covering the entire range of functions<sup>15</sup> known in grammar: predicate, complement, circumstantial,<sup>16</sup> attribute,<sup>17</sup> predicative, additional predicative element;<sup>18</sup> the *relateme* is directly dependent, in terms of its hypostases, with few exceptions,<sup>19</sup> on the part of speech through which the Ts is expressed.

---

<sup>12</sup> The *appositive relation* is not recognized; see, in this regard, [2 p67-68].

<sup>13</sup> For an overview of each type of relation, at each level, intra-sentence vs inter-sentence, see [18].

<sup>14</sup> For a delineation between the syntactic positions in the Romanian language, *structural positions* vs. *nonstructural positions*, with their subdivisions and respective names, see [8].

<sup>15</sup> For the status of the subject as a part of sentence, but a syntactic nonfunction, see [10 p382].

<sup>16</sup> For the opposition *complement* vs *circumstantial*, see [5 p56-60].

<sup>17</sup> For a *categorical-relational classification of the attribute*, in which the latter term of the function “accounts for” the subtype of the relateme through which it is actualized, see [10 p381-414].

<sup>18</sup> For the function of additional predicative element, see [8].

<sup>19</sup> There are parts of speech that have the *preposition-relateme* in common: for example, the large class of the substantival is opposed by two others: on the one hand, by non-personal verbal forms, the infinitive: *Ideea de a studia limba spaniolă e nouă.* [The idea of studying Spanish is new.] and the supine: *Mașina ta de spălat nu e bună de nimic.* [Your washing machine is no good.], on the other hand, by adverbs: *Dă-mi să citeșc, te rog, ziarul de ieri.* [Hand me over to read, please, yesterday's newspaper.]; *De când a sosit în România, nu mai dorește să lucreze.* [Since he arrived in Romania, he hasn't wanted to work.]

### 3. The relateme of the noun

From the large nominal class, we shall limit our analysis to the noun, which, from a morphosyntactic point of view, delineates two directions:

a. Firstly, this morphological value is generally acknowledged as a flexible one; therefore, it will actualize grammatical categories:<sup>20</sup> two at least, number and case, and three at most, number, case and determination; [4 p63];

b. Secondly, this morphological value can occupy, in the Romanian language, a structural position of the part of sentence and syntactic function type,<sup>21</sup> any of those mentioned above, except for the function of predicate,<sup>22</sup> which is specific<sup>23</sup> only to one class of words, namely verbs, and only in the personal forms.<sup>24</sup>

Depending on its position, as a common trait, the relateme of the noun is individualized in the form of two representative subdivisions which are mutually exclusive:<sup>25</sup> the *preposition-relateme* vs the *flective-relateme*,<sup>26</sup> the latter subtype actualizing itself as the expression of a single grammatical relational category,<sup>27</sup> specific to this part of speech, namely case.<sup>28</sup>

#### ***3.1. The case flective-relateme of common nouns, between the flective-relateme of the desinence type and the flective-relateme of the determinative article type***

<sup>20</sup> Gender is not recognized as a grammatical category in the noun class, see [13].

<sup>21</sup> The syntactic freedom of the noun is total: this part of speech can also occupy a structural position of the part of sentence but not syntactic function type, and any of the nonstructural positions, of the addressative type, of the appositive type.

<sup>22</sup> Referring, in fact, to the verbal predicate and the predicative auxiliary of the nominal predicate.

<sup>23</sup> We shall not enter the discussions relating to the placement of parts of speech like adverbials of manner or interjections in the position of a verbal predicate, whence the relevant names in grammar, *adverbial predicate* and *interjectional predicate*.

<sup>24</sup> When a verb is converted from a personal form to a non-personal form, the rapport between the *verb* and its *syntactic function* is also modified. In the absence of two essential predicative marks, *person* and *number*, any nonpersonal verbal form falls, automatically, within the scope of an *apredicative* or *extrapredicative function*.

<sup>25</sup> We cannot accept two different types of *relateme* for a certain syntactical function: for example, both the *flective-relateme* and the *preposition-relateme*, the rapport between the two subtypes being that of *logical disjunction*, either ... or ...

<sup>26</sup> In terms of its actualization, the *preposition-relateme* coincides with the prepositions and prepositional phrases that are specific to cases 3; see the opposition *case 1* vs *case 3* in [2 p95].

<sup>27</sup> For the opposition, in grammar, between *grammatical relational categories* and *grammatical oppositional categories*, see [2 p78-93].

<sup>28</sup> See for Romanian nouns, the inventory of *grammatical categories of relation*, [2 p80-82].

Firstly, the acceptance of determination as a grammatical category of the noun, namely the third, actualized or materialized in the flective of the noun, has several “cascading” and far from negligible consequences: proper nouns and common nouns in the vocative case are eliminated from the opposition *determinate* vs. *indeterminate*;<sup>29</sup> the flectional structure of the common noun is affected, at the level of the extension and sequence of words in the sentence; it becomes difficult to establish the flective-relateme of the syntactic function fulfilled in contexts in which the flective, by the force of things, extends to two flectional subunits.

Considering all the situations in which the common noun occurs, both as determinate and as indeterminate, its flective<sup>30</sup> materializes the following possibilities:<sup>31</sup>

*a. Monomorphematic flective.*<sup>32</sup>

a.1. Consisting of a flectional unit of the desinence type and materializing in all the NAccGD contexts in which the common noun appears in indeterminate form: *această casă* [*this house*], *aceste case* [*these houses*], *acestei case* [*to this house*], *acestor case* [*to these houses*], *care tren* [*which train*], *cărui tren* [*to which train*], *care trenuri* [*which trains*], *căror trenuri* [*to which trains*], *care băiat* [*which boy*], *cărui băiat* [*to which boy*], *care băieți* [*which boys*], *căror băieți* [*to which boys*].<sup>33</sup>

a.2. Consisting of a flectional unit of the determinative flective type and actualizing only in NAcc contexts, in the singular noun, mandatorily when the common noun has definite determination:<sup>34</sup> feminine and

<sup>29</sup> Common nouns in the vocative case do not have the *determinate* vs. *indeterminate* opposition; by being integrated in the vocative case, they become determinate, like proper nouns.

<sup>30</sup> This phenomenon involves only the phonetic body of the common noun; therefore, in this study, we do not take into account the presence of the definite determinative article in the phonetic body of the adjective proper pre-posed to the common noun, marking a *positional articulation*.

<sup>31</sup> We shall not be taking into account a special situation of the common noun in the vicinity of certain pre-posed adjectives proper; see, in this regard, [16].

<sup>32</sup> The status of feminine nouns ending in *-a*, *sarma* [*cabbage roll*], *pijama* [*pyjamas*], and in *-ea*, *cafea* [*coffee*], *stea* [*star*], *perdea* [*curtain*], *-i*, *ziua* [*day*] is controversial from the point of view of establishing the exact nature of the flective when these nouns are definitely determined, monomorphematically or bimorphematically: *sarmana* [*the cabbage roll*], *pijamaua* [*the pyjamas*], *cafeana* [*the coffee*], *steana* [*the star*], *perdeana* [*the curtain*], *ziua* [*the day*].

<sup>33</sup> Any common or proper noun in the vocative case represents a syntactic nonfunction, so regardless of the flectional composition of the word, we cannot take into consideration a *flective-relateme*, see [2 p287-88].

<sup>34</sup> Only the definite determinative article is in this situation because, in the case of indefinite determination, the flective of the common noun must be bimorphematic and discontinuous.

masculine nouns ending in *-ă*, feminine nouns ending in *-ie*, are contexts in which two complementary phenomena are well known: the suppression of the desinence and the accumulation of roles through the expression of the definite determinative article: [*mamă* → *mama* [mother → the mother], *tată* → *tata* [father → the father], *vie* → *via* [vineyard → the vineyard].

*b. Bimorphemic flective, consisting of two flexional subunits of the desinence and determinative article type:*

b.1. Flective-desinence + flective-definite determinative article: *băiatul*<sup>5</sup> [the boy], *băieții* [the boys], *băiatului* [to the boy], *băieților* [to the boys], *trenul* [the train], *trenului* [to the train], *trenurile* [the trains], *trenurilor* [to the trains];

b.2. Flective-desinence + flective-indefinite determinative article: *o fată* [a girl], *unei fete* [to a girl], *niște fete* [some girls], *unor fete* [to some girls]; *un băiat-Ø* [a boy], *unui băiat-Ø* [to a boy], *niște băieți* [some boys], *unor băieți* [to some boys]; *un tren-Ø* [a train], *unui tren-Ø* [to a train], *niște trenuri* [some trains], *unor trenuri* [to some trains].

Secondly, with regard to the precise identification of the *relateme* in the two contexts, a. and b., specialized Romanian studies do not provide very clear criteria; on the contrary, they emphasize a state of ambiguity by way of expression, especially in the latter situation.

Regardless of the moment in which these studies were written, they claim that:

On the one hand: “*The analysis of the noun’s flexional forms, considered outside of determination, is exhausted in a single stage: segmentation results in the release of the radical and of a non-analysable flective, which directly expresses the number and the case through the oppositions that it achieves...*” [6 p55] [emphasis ours] and, in the same study, “*One cannot ignore the affixes of the category of determination in describing the inflection of names, for several reasons: Firstly because this category is achieved through variable units of expression not only in relation to the values of determination, but also, at the same time, in relation to number and case...*” [6 p77] [emphasis ours] or “*The grammatical categories of the noun are achieved predominantly through flexional means: (a) morphemes or affixes that expressing the terms of the categories in solidary and sometimes redundant manner: desinence of number and case; enclitic affixes of the category of determination.*” [4 p77-78] [emphasis ours] and, in the same treatise: “*Besides by flexional means, the grammatical categories of the noun can also be expressed in analytical manner by: [...] the*

<sup>35</sup> The suppression of the desinence is the inverse of the *catalization* process, in this example, which appears in masculine and neutral common nouns, in the singular, NAcc, with negative actualization, hence a Ø desinence-flective, in the absence of definite determination: *băiat* → *băiatul* [boy → the boy], *tren* → *trenul* [train → the train], see [7].

*proclitic affixes of the category of determination, which mark gender, number and case.”* [4 p78]

On the other hand: “*The difference between –lor (in the example solzii pești**lor** [the scales **of** fish]) and **la** (in the example solzii **la** pește [the scales **of** fish]),<sup>36</sup> an article with the role of a relational flective compensating the deficiencies of the inventory of case desinences, the latter – a connective, is not essential, as long as both represent the same R for the structure of the syntagm, as they are carriers of the same relational meaning, so much so that considering *la* but not also –lor as T would be, among other things, an inconsistency.”* [2 p37] [emphasis ours] or “*This is not the case, however, of the example above (casa vecin**ului** [the neighbour’s house]), where there is an R, a flective-Rs (-**lui**), entitled to equal treatment with that of a connective-Rs.”* [2 p41] [emphasis ours]

On the basis of both approaches, the following traits may be highlighted:

(1.) From an inflectional perspective, in other words, as an exclusive manifestation of grammatical categories, which is a morphological trait that is also specific to the analysed lexical-grammatical class, and not taking into account the *relational* vs the *nonrelational* hypostases of the categories in question,<sup>37</sup> there appear to be two situations, depending on the “length” of the flective of the common noun:

a. In the flective of nondetermined and of definitely determined common nouns, in the case of the latter situation, exclusively in the nominative and the accusative, masculine and feminine nouns ending in –*ă* and feminine nouns ending in –*ie*, the phenomenon of *syncretism* is actualized, in the sense that more than one grammatical category is manifested:<sup>38</sup> under the flective-desinence two categories are actualized syncretically, namely number and case; under the flective-definite determinative article, three categories are actualized, namely number, case and determination.

b. In the flective of definitely and indefinitely determined common nouns, two complementary phenomena are actualized: *syncretism*, i.e., a set of grammatical categories manifests within each of the flectional subunits: number and case, in the flective-desinence, and number, case and determination; in the flective-definite and indefinite determinative article;

<sup>36</sup> For the two examples, see [2 p36-37].

<sup>37</sup> After all, the hypostasis *relational category (of relation)* vs *nonrelational category (of opposition)* can only be actualized by a grammatical category, which must be manifested in the flective of the word.

<sup>38</sup> For the concept of *syncretism* and the two distinct approaches, see [1 p479].

*redundancy*, [1 p424-425] i.e. the reiteration of the grammatical categories which are common to the two flectional subunits, number and case.<sup>39</sup>

(2.) From a relational perspective, according to the Cluj-based School of Grammar,<sup>40</sup> the status of the flective as an expression either of a *grammatical category of relation* or of a *grammatical category of opposition* becomes apparent by: giving priority to the much higher case functionality of the article in the presence of desinence. [11 p40]

Discussions have been limited only to the genitive and dative case forms of determined common nouns that accept the category of case in a relational hypostasis, expressed by the flective of the definite determinative article type, without supplementing the debate concerning the status of the other flectional subunit of the desinence type.

Based on those stated in (1.) and (2.), we shall inventory two situations in the actualization of the flective-relateme of common nouns:

a. The flective specific to the Romanian nondetermined common nouns, reduced to a flective of the desinence type, and to the definitely determined feminine and masculine nouns ending in *-ă*, exclusively in the nominative and the accusative, reduced to a flective of the definite determinative article type, as a common trait, does not raise any problems, because they are both carriers of the grammatical relational category of case; number and determination are grammatical categories of opposition, in other words, a *flective-opposeme*.

Thus, it is only by virtue of its case<sup>41</sup> that a noun is subordinated to a Tr, regardless of the morphological value of the latter, in the absence of the preposition or of the prepositional phrase; as an expression of the relation, the relateme is a *relateme-desinence* or a *relateme-flectivedefinite determinative article*.

b. Respecting the principle of the monosubordination of syntactic functions, in the sense that a Ts can be subordinated only once through a single relateme,<sup>42</sup> we consider it imperative to analyse the grammatical category of case from a relational viewpoint, expressed within the bimorphemic flective, i.e., simultaneously in the two flectional subunits.

---

<sup>39</sup> Some authors take into account gender as well, as a category expressed the second time in the flective of determination; see, in this regard, [11 p39-40].

<sup>40</sup> In this area, what was analysed for the first time was the status of those grammatical categories that are actualized in the flective, from a relational point of view: the well-known dichotomy proposed was that between the *flective of relation*, i.e. the materialization of the *grammatical categories of relation*, and the *flective of opposition*, i.e. the materialization of the *grammatical categories of opposition*; see, in this regard, [2 p 78-93].

<sup>41</sup> Put differently, by reference to one or another grammatical category, the same unit of expression can be either a *flective-relateme* or a *flective-opposeme*.

<sup>42</sup> In subordination the general principle concerns the exclusivity of relational means, see [9 p7-8].

Under these circumstances, we may understand that both components constitute the flective-relateme, so we can infer that the part of speech in question features a twofold, simultaneous potential of subordination to a Tr through two different types of flective: once, through the *flective-desinence*, the second time through the *flective-determinative article*.

However, a flexible part of speech<sup>43</sup> cannot be subordinated through different flecional types, materializing the same grammatical categories, twice, either to the same Tr, or to different Trs. Although two different situations appear to emerge from that discussion, in fact, the fundamental principle is complied with:

a. Personal verb forms in the pluperfect and the simple perfect. Under the flective of the lexemes that occur with these tenses of the past indicative, there manifest at least three and at most four flecional subunits, [6 p159-195] grouped as follows:

a.1. A flecional subtype of the type simple perfect grammatical suffix and two flecional subunits of the desinence type, i.e. a desinential group: the former materializes the grammatical category of number, while the latter materializes the grammatical category of person: *cântai* [I sang], where *-a* is one of the allomorphs of the simple perfect suffix, the negative desinence of number  $\emptyset$ , and *-i* is the positive desinence of person.

a.2. Two flecional subunits of the grammatical suffix type, i.e. a suffixal group, the former representing the perfect suffix, while the latter – the pluperfect suffix, and two flecional subunits of the desinence type, a desinential group, the former materializing the grammatical category of number, while the latter materializes the grammatical category of person: *cântasem* [I'd sung], where *-a* is one of the allomorphs of the perfect suffix, *-se* is the suffix of the pluperfect, the negative desinence  $\emptyset$  of number, and *-m* is the positive desinence of person.

b. In the same situation, there are other parts of speech, many pronominal adjectives in the singular, masculine, neutral, feminine,

---

<sup>43</sup> As a primary lexeme and as a derived lexeme. The situation of blended and unblended compound words, as well as that of phrases specific to certain flexible parts of speech is delicate on several accounts and will not be treated in this paper, as it should represent the subject of a study in its own right. This discussion will approach neither the situation of some personal pronouns like *dânsul* [he], nor that of certain pronouns like *altul* [another], or of certain collective cardinal numerals like *primul* [the first], which also have a bimorphematic flective: the first subunit represents a flective-desinence, while the second subunit represents a formative flective-article.

exclusively in the genitive and the dative:<sup>44</sup> *căruî* [to whose], *cărei* [to whose], *niciunui* [to neither], *niciunei* [to neither], *vreunei* [to any], *vreunui* [to any] etc.

These lexemes give rise, in these contexts, to a bimorphematicflective consisting of two flectional subunits: a subunit of the desinence type in which gender is actualized, *-u*, for masculine, *-e* for feminine, a subunit of the desinence type in which number and case are actualized, the same, regardless of gender, *-u*. [10 p249-269]

In the case of the personal verb forms mentioned above, the two flectional subunits of the desinence type unquestionably represent the flective of verbal agreement, which constitute a *flective-relateme of number and person* only if they are taken *together*, not separately.

Even if they were to be separated in a morphematic analysis and even if they represent flectional subunits of the same type, we cannot accept the fact that the verb in a verbal form – the predicate – is subordinated twice through two different relatemes: once through the flective-relateme of number, the second time through the flective-relateme of person. In fact, they *both represent concurrently the flective-relateme*. The consolidation of this position is supported by the idea that, apart from these personal verb forms, all the others have a single flectional subunit wherein the two categories of relation are syncretically actualized.<sup>45</sup>

In the case of pronominal adjectives, given that the adjectival is generally characterized by a *flective-relateme of gender, number and case*,<sup>46</sup> even if they are separated as flectional subunits of the same type, both will represent only *together* the flective-relateme of these lexemes.

We should support delineating the flective-relateme of common nouns with a bimorphematic flective, found in a structural position of the part of sentence and syntactic function type, in the absence of the preposition or of the prepositional phrase, along the terms proposed by G.G. Neamțu: [8] in contexts in which the noun flective is bimorphematic, the flective-relateme will be represented by the flective definite and indefinite determinative article, as an expression of the grammatical category of relation, namely case, giving priority to its greater case functionality. The

---

<sup>44</sup> In the plural, in the genitive and the dative, they all actualize a bimorphematic flective *-or*, within which all the three specific grammatical categories of gender, number and case are actualized.

<sup>45</sup> The person and number of personal verb forms may occur only as grammatical categories of relation, unlike case, for example, which, depending on the syntactic position, may occur both relationally and nonrelationally.

<sup>46</sup> For numerals with an adjectival value, with few exceptions, a *flective-relateme* of gender and case is actualized; number is considered a lexical-semantic category; for details, see also [12] and [15].

same category, even though expressed through desinence, will become passive as a hypostasis, turning, along with number, into grammatical categories of opposition.

Therefore, to refine matters even further, let us highlight the following fact: at the level of the flective-relateme, there appears the binary rapport of one relateme per unit of expression, hence, a flectional unit, or of one relateme for two units of expression of the same type, in other words, two flectional subunits.

In the latter situation, in the context of each subunit, the different grammatical categories that are actualized ensure only together the subordination of the function to a Ts.

The situation of common nouns with a bimorphemic *flective*, as Ts, is not included in this discussion, given that even if there are two flectional units, they are different typologically, repeating the common grammatical categories, that is, number and case. That is precisely why they cannot constitute together a flective-relateme. Only one can hold that role; in this case, it is the flective-determinative article that does that.

#### 4. Conclusions

Respecting the principle of syncretism and redundancy, within the bimorphemicflective of a common noun, the common grammatical categories of number and case will be actualized twice.

Filling a structural position of the part of sentence and syntactic function type, in the absence of prepositions or prepositional phrases, common nouns materialize the following flectional units and subunits as *relatemes*, as expressions of the only grammatical category of relation, namely case: a flective-relateme of the desinence type or of the definite determinative article type when the flective is monomorphemic; a flective-relateme of the definite or indefinite determinative article, when the flective is bimorphemic.

#### References

---

- [1] Dicționar de științe ale limbii/Dictionary of Language Sciences. București: Nemira; 2005.
- [2] Drașoveanu DD. Teze și antiteze în sintaxa limbii române/Theses and Antitheses in the Syntax of the Romanian Language. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium; 1997. pp. 21-24, 29-34, 36-37, 41, 67-68, 78-93, 80-82, 95, 226-243, 287-288, 284.

- [3] Gramatica de bază a limbii române/The Basic Grammar of the Romanian Language. București. Univers Enciclopedic Gold. 2010: 686.
- [4] Gramatica limbii române. I. Cuvântul/Romanian Grammar. I. The Word. București: Editura Academiei Române; 2005.
- [5] Gramatica limbii române. II. Enunțul/Romanian Grammar. II. The Sentence. București: Editura Academiei Române; 2005.
- [6] Guțu Romalo V. Morfologie structurală a limbii române (substantiv, adjectiv, verb)/The Structural Morphology of the Romanian Language (The Noun, the Adjective, the Verb). București: Editura Academiei R.S.R.; 1968. pp. 55. 77, 159-195, 362.
- [7] Neamțu GG. Curs de limbă română contemporană, Morfologie/A Course on the Contemporary Romanian Language, Morphology. Facultatea de Litere. Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai; 2005-2006.
- [8] Neamțu GG. Curs de limbă română contemporană, Sintaxă/A Course on the Contemporary Romanian Language, Syntax. Cluj-Napoca: Facultatea de Litere. Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai; 2005-2006.
- [9] Neamțu GG. Teoria și practica analizei gramaticale. Distincții și... distincții (cu trei seturi de grile rezolvate și comentate)/The Theory and Practice of Grammatical Analysis. Distinctions and ... Distinctions (with three sets of solved and commented grids). Ediția a II-a. Pitești: Paralela 45; 2007. pp. 7-8, 502.
- [10] Neamțu GG. Studii și articole gramaticale/Grammar Studies and Articles. Cluj-Napoca: Napoca Nova; 2014. pp. 259-269, 381-414, 382, 540.
- [11] Pană Dindelegan G. Elemente de gramatică. Dificultăți, controverse, noi interpretări/Elements of Grammar. Difficulty, Controversy, New Interpretations. București: Humanitas Educational; 2003. pp. 39, 40, 261.
- [12] Roman DM. Numărul numeralului românesc, o categorie deictică d.l. de tip lexico-semantic, și implicațiile sale în ceea ce privește acordul paradigmatic și sintagmatic/The Number of Romanian Numerals, a Deictic Category d.l. of the lexical-semantic type, and its implications in terms of paradigmatic and syntagmatic agreement. In: Soare L, Sămărăscu A, Dumitru A, editors. Studii de filologie. In honorem Ștefan Găitânaru. Pitești: Editura Universității din Pitești; 2016: 335-346.
- [13] Roman DM. Noun Gender in Romanian, a Lexical-Semantic Category. LUMEN. Section: Philosophy and Humanistic Science. 2016 Jun; 4 (1): 27-43. Available from: [http://lumenjournals.com/philosophy-and-humanistic-sciences/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/LOGOS\\_Philosophy\\_iunie\\_2016\\_27to43.pdf](http://lumenjournals.com/philosophy-and-humanistic-sciences/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/LOGOS_Philosophy_iunie_2016_27to43.pdf). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/lumenphs.2016.0401.02>
- [14] Roman DM. The Preposition-Opposeme of the Romanian Substantival Non-sT. LUMEN. Section: Philosophy and Humanistic Science. 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](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>

- [17] Roman DM, Bocoș C. Numărul numeralelor cardinale și ordinale românești, o categorie lexico-semantică/The Number of Romanian Cardinal and Ordinal Numerals, a Lexical-Semantic Category. *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica*. 2016; 17 (1): 278-287.
- [18] 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>
- [19] 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>
- [20] Roman DM. Relația: identitatea unei școli de gramatică/Relationship: The Identity of a Grammar School. In: Parpală. E. *Identități ficționale și practici discursive [Fictional identities and discursive practices]*. Craiova. Universitaria. București. ProUniversitaria. 2017 (sub tipar/ under printing)