

UNIVERSITATEA BABEȘ-BOLYAI CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE LITERE

THE POST-WAR CONTEMPORARY ROMANIAN GRAMMAR
SCHOOL OF CLUJ. IDEAS, CONCEPTS, TERMS,
FORMULATIONS

SUMMARY

Phd Adviser:

PROF. UNIV. DR. G. G. NEAMȚU

PhD Candidate:

PUȘCAȘ DANA AURORA

2015

SUMMARY

The PhD thesis entitled *The Post-War Contemporary Romanian Grammar School of Cluj. Ideas, Concepts, Terms, Formulations* is trying to highlight the contribution of post-war linguists from Cluj to the continuation, development and dissemination of the fundamental principles and ideas of the predecessors regarding the issues of the Romanian language.

The approach to this subject was suggested to us by the fact that, to this day, there has not been such a study, there have only been a few disparate articles (see Bibliography) that only presented theoretical overall aspects regarding the activity of the post-war linguists from Cluj.

Our study presents the post-war grammar school of Cluj by emphasizing the remarkable contribution of the grammarians grouped around professor D. D. Draşoveanu, considered to be the rightful creator of the so called 'Neo-traditional Relational Syntax School'. But, in order to bring the achievements and the scientifically level attained by the linguists of Cluj in this period to the level of their predecessors, we dedicated the First Chapter of our thesis to the interwar period, where we briefly presented the activity of the coryphaei of the Cluj School headed by Sextil Puşcariu who also initiated the *Museum of Romanian Language* - in fact the first Romanian institute of linguistics. The studies and articles published between the pages of the *Dacoromania*, the magazine of the Museum, but also the monumental works, *The Dictionary of Romanian Language* and *The Romanian Linguistic Atlas* have laid a good foundation for the continuity of the spirit of the Cluj School through the remarkable concern continuously asserted to the study of the contemporary Romanian language.

The remarkable amplex of the linguistic material and the great number of representatives of this philological school of thought have obliged us to some restrictions that are also visible in the structure of our thesis. Thus, in the Second Chapter we tried to portray, in general lines, the situation of the Cluj philology in the 50's – 70's period and until the present time, mentioning the most outstanding representatives - Ioan Pătruţ, Romulus Todoran, Pompiliu Dumitraşcu, joined later by professors, who – starting from Romanian language facts – have opened new modern pathways that modern linguistics takes pride in, the semiotics, the theory of the text, pragmatics and eco-linguistics.

At the end of the chapter we also expressed our option to only analyze the grammarians of Cluj and we also invoked two reasons: the vastness of the subject that would need more time than the period of time allocated to write a PhD thesis and the necessary unity for such endeavor.

As a result, in the Third Chapter, *Grammarians*, that also represents the center of our thesis, we also reviewed the work of the professors - Mircea Zdrenghea, Cornel Săteanu, D. D. Draşoveanu, Ştefan Hazy, Viorel Hodiş, Gligor Gruişă, Dumitru Bejan, G. G. Neamţu, Maria Vulişici Alexandrescu – in our attempt to capture the main ideas and concepts they followed, analyzed and developed.

This way we maintained a unity of the work, only analyzing grammarians and overlooking those who have also approached other fields such as stylistics, dialectology, Slavonic studies, text theory or pragmatics. Even from among the grammarians we only stopped at those who, by the nature of their activity, have contributed to a better visibility of this university in the Romanian linguistic circles. For this purpose, we were guided by their presence, greater or smaller, with quotes or only in the bibliography, in the specialty works of other linguists from the country or abroad.

As a working method there have been two main investigation directions: (1) gathering and processing the data that refer to the grammarians named above and (2) the overall study of the work of each representative for emphasizing ideas and concepts circulated. Thus, we were able to compare the results conveyed by the professors from Cluj with the academic works or works of other Romanian and foreign researchers.

In Chapter IV we offered a *Glossary of Terms, Concepts, Assertions, Ideas, Hypotheses, Formulations Used by the Grammarians of Cluj*, in order to also emphasize in this way the contribution of the linguists of Cluj to the enrichment of this field of activity and placing it to the level of European and global linguistics.

In Chapter V we presented a bibliography of the works of these authors, followed by *Findings and Bibliography*.

Returning to the contents of our thesis, we mention that we chose to present the individual activity of the authors comparatively in chronological order, to best capture the personality and the contribution of each of them to the development of the Romanian grammar studies. We also summarize here the contribution of some of them.

The didactic and scientific activity of Mircea Zdrenghea (1914-2001) is mostly related to the study of the Romanian language morphology. `His didactic gift – as G. Gruică emphasized – was manifested in the balance he accomplished between the scientific rigor of the content and the methodological accessibility of the overview. He translated ponderous concepts of the new research methods into a familiar terminology, he explained them thoroughly, clearly, made them digestible. An arid discipline such as morphology became accessible just by the focus on the methodological aspect”¹. Mircea Zdrenghea was the professor who made the passage between the `golden` generation of the philology school of Cluj, manifested between the two World Wars and the new post-war generation, to which the `illustrious` professor was attached.

When it comes to the morphology class, published in lithographed form in 1970, we must mention that the idea that lead to the entire endeavor was that of a tight bond between morphology and syntax: "the modification of the form of words is demanded by the establishment of possible relations between the notions expressed by the respective words, otherwise said, morphology only exists because syntax exists” and "there is a strict interdependency between both, as none could exist without the other” (AGS: 51).

When referring to *grammar categories*, the author highlights the fact that the morphological modifications "are not performed randomly, but according to grammar categories (gender, number, case, time, etc.)", and this means that these reflect "the essential properties of objects and the most general relations between them" also constituting "the internal method of organization of the material of forms in a language" (*Class*: 5). The grammar categories and the means by which they are performed (namely "their own formal indications") differentiate languages and certify their specificity.

When it comes to the *personal gender* which was analyzed by several specialists in their works, the professor from Cluj supports the thesis of Al. Rosetti that this is "a testimony of the care of the Romanian language to create a difference between common names and person names or personified names".

The grammar category of *case* is also regarded through the connections between morphology and syntax, the case being the form taken by nouns and their substitutes to express syntactic relations.

¹ Gruică 2001: 3.

"*The nominative*, although equal in form with the accusative case, cannot be mistaken with it because it is never requested as a verb as the accusative, but on the contrary, *it requires a verb*² - this idea was resumed, analyzed and substantiated by D. D. Draşoveanu when he supported the dependence thesis of the predicate to the subject (Draşoveanu, 1997: 205-208) or the thesis of ranking of cases. The nominative is also called *independent, direct case* or *casus rectus* and has the syntactic functions of subject, predicative and apposition³, and within the subordination report the nominative is *regent*, both of the predicate⁴, and the attribute, and this is why professor Zdrengea considers „that it would be more appropriate for the nominative to be named *regent case, non-subordination case*, and the genitive, dative and accusative *dependent cases*, because they are characterized by subordination" (Zdrengea, *Class*: 22).

Mircea Zdrengea himself asserts about this class: "From 1952, when I was assigned the *Contemporary Romanian Language* class, my attention was focused on the grammar issues, mainly morphological ones that I thought were not explained satisfactorily: *A New Classification of the Parts of Speech, Is the Vocative a Case?* - are some of the articles and studies in which I try to clarify some issues. The results I have reached form, I believe so, the personal side of the class."⁵

The balance between the scientific rigor and the accessibility that we noted in professor Mircea Zdrengea's works is also manifested in the "monumental edition" – as G. Gruică⁶ names it, or "a work that is monumental in size and value" as expressed by D. D. Draşoveanu⁷ – the work of Samuil Micu and Gheorghe Şincai, *Elementa linguae daco-romanae sive valachicae*, and also in other studies related to this work or the history of the Romanian linguistics.

Its purpose, as professor Zdrengea has shown, was to "demonstrate the latinity of our language, the romanity and the continuity of the Romanian people in Dacia, and by that, its indisputable age" in a period when "the Romanians from Transylvania were deprived of their political and social rights on the grounds that they would have come later to these sites"⁸.

² Zdrengea, *Class*, p. 19; 21, note 3, with reference to D. D. Draşoveanu, *Of the Nature of the Relation Between the Subject and the Predicate*, în CL, III, 1958, p. 175-182.

³ Zdrengea, *Class*, p. 21.

⁴ Cf. Draşoveanu, CL, III, 1958, p. 175 şi 181.

⁵ Apud Viorel Hodiş, *Articles and Studies*, 2, 2006, p. 265.

⁶ Mircea Zdrengea (1914-2001), in *Dacoromania*, s. n., V-VI, 2000-2001, Cluj-Napoca, p. 338;

⁷ Prof. Dr. Mircea Zdrengea, in *Studia*, XXIX, 1984, p. 78.

⁸ *Elementa linguae*, p. 11.

Therefore, the writings of professor Zdrengea, including those dedicated to the works of S. Micu, prove his meticulousity regarding the subjects he studied. They are not very large, but are rich in ideas and facts that are worth retaining. This is why, it is only proper to appreciate his merits of tireless researcher in the field of language, especially morphology – which he was particularly attracted to. As a result, Mircea Zdrengea is quoted and present in the bibliography of most Romanian grammar studies, including the new *Academy Grammar* (editions 2005, 2008, 2010).

D. D. Draşoveanu was a leading figure of the Romanian linguistics of the second half of the XXth century and distinguished himself as a true continuer of the "Philological School of Thought from Cluj" in the post-war period, establishing himself from the very beginning through the finesse and rigor of the grammar analysis. "His studies and articles, said professor G. G. Neamţu, have a remarkable density in an almost mathematical wording and each study may be considered a "summary" or set of "conclusions" to a more extensive work"⁹.

His first article is published in 1954, *Concessional or Adversative?*, but becomes known by the publishing of *Grammatical and Stylistic Analyzes* signed by D. D. Draşoveanu, Pompiliu Dumitraşcu and Mircea Zdrengea, I ed., Bucharest: Editura ştiinţifică, 1959; II ed., Bucharest: Editura ştiinţifică, 1966. The theoretical chapter from the beginning of the book, *Elements of Syntactic Analysis (the Sentence)* (p. 9-48), as the practical one, *Grammatical Analyzes* (p. 63-154), signed together with Mircea Zdrengea, presents him as a formed syntax expert with ambitions towards the synchronous syntax and this will mark his entire work till the end of his life.

The lecture held in front of the students also presents him as a remarkable teacher and a skilled methodist as remembered in the memory of his students. "His lecture, professor Ştefan Oltean noted, was unique at the Faculty of Letters by its force and impact and created a state of effervescence in those who listened to him. The phenomena cannot be ruptured from the absolutely brilliant intuitions, the flawless logic of his thinking, built on arguments, counterarguments and counterarguments to the counterarguments"¹⁰. The grammatical analyzes performed by D. D. Draşoveanu, as Mircea Popa also emphasized, "were a delightful recreational and creative school logical exercise, ... his methods of making you understand the mechanisms of

⁹ Neamţu, *In memoriam*, 332.

¹⁰ Ştefan Oltean, *Professor D. D. Draşoveanu*, in *Studia*, XLVI, 2001, 3, p. 11.

the language were very different from the traditional ones and his grammatical analyzes of sentences and clauses always deviated you from mechanical learning, "by heart" and stereotypical thinking"¹¹, he was an "outstanding teacher (unfortunately too harsh on himself and this is why he wrote extremely rarely and with much effort)"¹².

In his entire activity, performed as professor or circulated in the studies and articles he published, D. D. Draşoveanu built a personal system over the years that is a profoundly original approach to grammar, a system that, through its concepts, definitions and mathematical organization has become unmistakable. This is why the ideas he brought have remained important and he circulated them in the approach of the syntax of the Romanian language and they have become a property of syntax studies or, at least, a source for long meditations from behalf of the specialists, such as: the phrase, the syntactic relation, the unicity, the relation grammatical categories, the cases, their classification (C₁, C₂, C₃), the casual concomitant variation, the predicate, the desinential and intonational predicate, the diatheses, the grammatical ellipse and sliding, the relation flectives, the flective *pe (on)* vs the preposition *pe (on)*, the conjunctive vs the conjunctive etc. And all these "*syntactic phenomena analyzed in the pages of the book (Theses and Antitheses in the Syntax of Romanian Language) have been regarded from the point of view of the **relation** which opened the pathway for new perspectives either in revealing outstanding issues, or in the rethinking of others*", the author himself asserts in the *Afterword*.

Returning to the order of the cases, we mention the following: "1st order case, C₁, it is the *flexional* case, the sole generator of a (some) function; it manifests itself in nouns and pronouns; C₂ is the case manifested *the second* time – together with the gender and number - , *by grammatical agreement*, in the word agreed, adjective, participle, ... ; C₃ is the case of the noun, pronoun, "*required by prepositions*" (p. 80-81).

From here on, by analogy, all the other categories will also be able to fall in one, two or all of the three orders according to the inferred layout (p. 82): gender₁, gender₂; number₁, number₂; person₁, person₂, person₃; mode₁; diathesis₁; time₁, time₂, time₃.

¹¹ Mircea Popa, *ap.* Viorel Hodiş, *Articles and Studies*, 3, Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint Publishing House, 2011, p. 8.

¹² *Ap.* Hodiş, 2011: 8.

As a result, by analogy, we must retain that all the "*categories₂ are of relation*", and the "*categories₃ are not of relation*", as the relational meaning is conveyed by the connective by which the hypostasis was defined" (p. 83).

Regarding **al** (*a, ai, ale*) (*of*), that was described as an article¹³, article with a pronoun quality¹⁴, pronoun¹⁵, Draşoveanu analyses the structures in which it appears: (1) together with a genitive or possessive adjective, but without a subject/object to its left: *ai vecinului* (*of the neighbour*), *ai săi* (*his*); (2) with a subject/object to its left: *copii ai vecinului* (*children of the neighbour*), *copii ai săi* (*his children*); (3) after and adjective: *iubitor al cărţilor* (*book lover*) - in order to detach the behaviour of the lexeme.

In the first situation, *ai vecinului* (*of the neighbour*), *ai săi* (*his*), results that: (1) *ai* (*of*) is, on the one hand, replaceable with a noun, *copiii vecinului* (*the neighbour's children*, *copiii săi* (*his children*), and on the other hand may also have the values of the noun: subject: *ai mei sunt ...* (*mine are ...*), dative indirect complement: *spune-le alor mei că ...* (*tell mine that ...*), circumstantial complement of place: *stau lângă ai vecinului* (*they are standing next to the neighbour's*) etc. Therefore, the pronoun value is obvious ("the pronoun basically calls all the syntax of the noun"); (2) it is not a sign of the genitive (*al* (*of*) is not a form of genitive) and it does not justify the denomination *genitive* from the phrase *genitive article*; (3) it cannot be taken together with the genitive. Therefore, it follows that **al** (**of**) is a regent term either of a genitive or a possessive adjective (acc. also Guţu Romalo, 1973: 82).

From the (2) stance – *copii ai vecinului* (*children of the neighbour*), *copii ai săi* (*children of him*) – it is deductible that *al* (*of*) does not agree but resumes the noun and this fact is also emphasized by Valeria Guţu Romalo, who asserts that *al* (*of*) "has a similar role to that of atonic forms of the personal pronoun in the case of double expression of the complement" (1973: 83), and, in a certain way, according to Ion Coteanu, when he asserts that *al* (*of*) is an anaphoric pronoun (*ap.* Draşoveanu, 1997: 105). The resuming implies the observing of the gender and number of the subject and the object: *copil al vecinului* (*child of the neighbour*), *copii ai vecinului* (*children of the neighbour*), *fetiţă a vecinului* (*daughter of the neighbour*), *fetiţe ale vecinului* (*daughters of the neighbour*), and this confirms that *al* is a "nounal" (p. 105).

¹³ Avram, 1980; Textbooks.

¹⁴ Iordan, 1954: 342; GA I: 107; Guţu Romalo, 1973: 82, 137; Guţu Romalo, 1974: 136; Avram, 1986: 73; Brâncuş, 220.

¹⁵ Puşcariu, 1940: 52; Zdrenghea, 1965: 129; Manoliu, 1968: 91; Coteanu, 1969: 111; Florea, 1983: 94.

Stance (3) – *un om iubitor al cărților* (a book loving man) – leads us again to a situation of "resuming", resuming of *iubitor* (loving) and not of *om* (man) (*man of books* means something else). But, in order to prove that *iubitor* (loving) is a noun and not an adjective¹⁶ (a noun cannot resume an adjective), Drașoveanu refers to H. Tiktin, who names their derivatives in *-tor*, "nouns verbal adjectives" (*ap.* Drașoveanu, 1997: 105).

Therefore, the analysis of the mentioned structures, with facts detached from it, lead to the following conclusions:

- 1) *Al* (*of*) is, in all structures, a pronoun, regardless if it substitutes a noun as in 1 or resumes a noun as in 2. and 3.
- 2) *Al* (*of*) is regent of either a G_1 , or a possessive adjective and it cannot be taken together with it.
- 3) The possessives are divided into two lexical-grammatical classes: "possessive pronouns" (*al*) (*of*) and "possessive adjectives" (*meu, mea, ...*) (*mine*), from whose paradigms *lor* (*their*) must be excluded¹⁷ (p. 106).

Regarding the predicate, following the analyzes performed, Drașoveanu considers that when it comes to the Romanian language, there are two categories of predicates: ***the desinential predicate***, characterized by person and number, specific to the verb and the ***tonetic predicate***, based on the idea of *intonation*, understood as a method of "variation of the height of the voice during speech" (DEX, s. v.), that leads, according to the contents, to other two subdivisions: a. *hortative-imperative tonetic predicate* – the interjections: *Na!* (*There!*), *Iată!* (*Look!*) – and b. *appellative tonetic predicate* – the nouns (in vocative: *Ioane!* and nominative appellative: *Sanda!*), them also having common notes, but also distinctions.

Among the philologists of Cluj that have reached full maturity, G. G. Neamțu is one of the most devoted continuers of the post-war generation – Mircea Zdrenghea and D. D. Drașoveanu – mainly of the second, to whom he acknowledges his inclination several times.

A first example is offered by the book *The Predicate in the Romanian Language*, published in 1986, dedicated to the master: „A modest *TRIBUTE* to my syntax professor, D. D. Drașoveanu”, and in the foreword of which it is written: "As a direction in the private research of the issue of language facts analyzed here, this work is a tribute to the grammatical conception

¹⁶ According to Mioara Avram, *iubitor* (loving) is an adjective, with a genitive indirect complement (1980).

¹⁷ In GA, *lor* (*their*) appears at the personal pronoun (p. 138) and also at the possessive pronoun (p. 156).

systematically and sequentially issued in a series of studies and articles and also in the *Syntax Course* held at the Faculty of Philology of Cluj-Napoca by prof. univ. dr. D. D. Draşoveanu” (Neamţu, 1986: 7).

And later, in *The Theory and Practice of the Grammatical Analysis. Distinctions and ... Distinctions* (IIIrd edition, Piteşti, 2008), we find the following assertions: "... the book has a personality of its own, one marked by the spirit of the neo-traditional relational syntax of Cluj initiated and practiced for almost forty years by the late professor D. D. Draşoveanu, a very profound and original syntax expert, exceptional professor whose student, I like to say, I also was, along with most of the grammarians of Cluj" (Neamţu, 2008: 7), or "The overall grammatical conception of this book, a neo-traditional orientation book, logical and partially structuralist, is tributary to the best of D. D. Draşoveanu's works..." (Neamţu, 2008: 16).

Indeed, G. G. Neamţu, in the studies and articles published, continues and deepens the ideas initiated by D. D. Draşoveanu and most of the time completes the results of the master or reaches ideas that are richer and more sophisticated.

The most important issues he analyzed are: the predicate, the nominal predicate, the compound or complex predicate, the diatheses, lexemes with several values, the issue of the cases, etc.

From the analysis we performed in our thesis on these, we found that the results and the presentation method is much enriched, argued and extremely convincing. The analysis itself performed on the cases brings another level of understanding and confirms, once again, the validity of their structure that D. D. Draşoveanu divides into three categories: Ist order cases that generate functions, IInd order cases engaged by agreement and IIIrd order cases required by prepositions (Draşoveanu 1997: 94-100).

Besides, the author himself mentions the contributions he has made to the field of grammar: "the interpretation of *cel (the)* in all contexts, including in the "structure" of the relative superlative as semi-independent demonstrative pronoun (adjective); the clear indication of a *time accusative* in Romanian (with the necessary arguments) at the expense of an adverbial statute; the theorizing and argumentation of the concept of *procasual* form (= invariable form of nominative-accusative on the positions of a genitive-dative: *Pro G, Pro D*), with applications in the field of the noun and pronoun; a categorially-relational classification of the attribute in Romanian language up to the last details and the terminological consequences; the formulation

of the principle of *exclusivity/unicity* of the relational means in subordination; the assertion and argumentation of a lexical-semantic content that is different from zero for any verb, including the so-called copulative *a fi (to be)*; the morphological reevaluation of some formation with the relatives *cât (how many)*, *ce (what)* etc., by passing them from conjunctions (conjunctive phrases) to *adverbs* and *atypical relative adverbial phrase* (with autonomous syntactic functions); the reduction of the number of "syntactic monsters" of the "preposition + adjective" type by interpreting the adjective as *noun* that originates from the adjective by unmarked conversion; identification of the means of performance in expression of the *categorical meaning* (in the Coşer acceptance); the classification of all verbal forms accompanied by a *reflexive*, including by the "impersonal" *se* to collocations (= groups of two terms and the relation between them); the establishment of an inventory of *litigation issues* (over 20) regarding the *morpho-syntax of the possessives*; the assertion and argumentation of the idea that *al (a ...)* (*of*) is always a *possessive pronoun* (semi-independent), except for the morpheme quality in the structure of the ordinal numeral and including the stance as a *duplicate* (by anticipation or resuming) of the possessed object noun" (Neamţu 2014: X-XII).

It is only fair to mention that professor G. G. Neamţu refers to D. D. Draşoveanu every time a certain aspect has been also discussed by the latter also and this must be considered both as a tribute and appreciation of his mentor and also as an exceptional scientific probity to himself.

Professor Cornel Săteanu has also the merit of having modeled the Romanian grammar. In his articles, but most of all in his book, *Time and Temporality in the Contemporary Romanian Language*, reviewed by two of the professors from Cluj, Kis Emese and G. G. Neamţu, C. Săteanu distinguished himself as a skillful grammarian.

The study mentioned above is a monographic research on the expression of the idea of time in the contemporary Romanian language through verbal-adverbial phrases in which the verb/adverb interaction is directed in both ways, from the verb to the adverb and from the adverb to the verb. Conclusive in this regard is the chapter *Linguistic Update* where, within a unitary and coherent graphic presentation of the idea of time, the author presents the temporal axes of the "flow of time" – the primary and the secondary. The first one contains the verbal tenses that report action directly to the present moment (the Present, the Simple Perfect, the Composed Perfect and the Future I) and the second one that is formed of the tenses that have another

reference point than the present, namely the past and the future (the Imperfect, the More than Perfect and Future II).

Based on an impressive factual analysis – as G. G. Neamțu asserts (1981: 344) – the author deduces, assembles, corrects and remakes the parts of the system and harmoniously integrates the previous contributions also so that in the end he could present the system built in a congealed, nuanced and detailed form of the specific expression of the concept of time, with examples supported by statistic data, after the approximation formula.

By accentuating the adverbial aspect, C. Săteanu limits the inventory of units that compose the adverbial time system to 55 adverbs (adverbial phrases), distributed, depending on the function (semantic value) into three subsystems: *date adverbs* (*now, today, yesterday, tomorrow, then etc.*), *durative adverbs* (*always, never, anytime etc.*) and *iterative adverbs* (*in the evening, at times, sometimes*). The data supplement offered by distribution brings other specifications also, regarding the closeness and distinctions between certain tenses and time adverbs.

The conclusion given forth by the study is that "the establishing of the time and its expression in the contemporary Romanian language is made by the semantic connexion extricated by the time adverb contexts by phrasal verbal-adverbial relations" (p. 243).

Therefore, through the way he reflected on the subject he treated – the phrase, the attribute, the composed predicate, the idea of time in grammar – through the research method he applied, but mostly through the conclusions he formulated, the work of C. Săteanu has imposed itself in the specialty circles and constituted the starting point for other studies and researches.

As for G. Gruiță, Ștefan Hâzy, Dumitru Bejan, Viorel Hodiș, Maria Vulișici Alexandrescu, we have to mention that they also resumed some of the themes debated by their masters such as: *the predicate and predicativity* (Șt. Hâzy), *the agreement in Romanian language* (G. Gruiță), *the apposition, the supplementary predicative element* (V. Hodiș), *the statute of some adverbs and conjunctions* (Șt. Hâzy, M. Vulișici-Alexandrescu) or elaborated grammar studies: *The Grammar of the Romanian Language. Compendium* (D. Bejan), *The syntax of the Romanian language* (M. Vulișici Alexandrescu). They were, however, extraordinarily good in adjacent fields: *contrastive grammar* (Șt. Hâzy), *issues for language cultivation* (G. Gruiță, V. Hodiș).

One of their great merits, however, was that by resuming some themes, they modeled them, amplified them and supplemented them with new highlights and exceptional facts.

Generally, the authors we analyzed had few edited works (D. D. Draşoveanu, Mircea Zdrenghea, C. Săteanu, Ştefan Házzy, etc.), but they distinguished themselves by an assiduous publishing activity, with specialty studies and articles that have a great scientific probity and a vast richness of facts.

We highlighted during the development of our presentation the fact that there are common places in the perimeter of the "morphology-syntax Cluj school" that have become, not only for those instructed and cultivated at Cluj-Napoca, but also for many others - "almost consumer goods". We mention some of them to which also professor Neamţu refers to in his recent book, *Grammatical Studies and Articles: Mono-subordination of the supplementary predicative element; the interpretation of the predicative name as independent syntactic function, not included in the predicate; the casual exclusively nominative realization of the subject with taxing the apparent realizations in other cases (genitive, dative, accusative) as "false" exceptions, including by relatives – hence the solution to decumulate the "cumulative" relatives in the analysis; the double/multiple subordination at an inter-clause level; the apposition – syntactic non-function, non-report fact from the parenthetical category; rejection of a conclusive coordination and assimilating it to the copulative one; formal subordination by agreement (in number and person) of the predicate to the subject, denying the quality of the latter as a subordinate (= privileged complement) of the predicate-verb or placing it into an interdependency relation (= bilateral dependency); occupying the position of predicate of the verbs at non-personal forms (the Infinitive, the Gerund, the Supine) from contractions and consequent renaming – pro-predicate; the distinction, at a regent level between condition and selectional restriction; the exclusive binary character of the phrase; the lexical sense (= notional, qualifying, adverbial) vs relational sense antinomy and, as a result, the lexeme vs. relateme antinomy; the reduction of the types of syntactic relations to two (and exclusively two) – coordination vs. subordination opposed by a set of objective characteristics; the paradigmatic agreement vs. syntagmatic agreement antinomy, one of them being non-relational and the other relational (and generator of functions); the successive refinement of the functional-relational classification of cases (case₁, case₂, case₃) (Neamţu 2014: IX-X).*

The last chapter of our thesis, *Glossary of Terms, Concepts, Assertions, Ideas, Hypotheses, Formulations Used by the Grammarians of Cluj* (p. 144-170), presents, in the form of dictionary articles, 111 formations in alphabetical order.

These are either specific to the school of thought from Cluj or are used in some acceptations. At the majority of the formations, in addition to describing a type of dictionary, we also present the source (the grammarians and the works where these appear) and some reporting concerning the current/official interpretations (GLR 1963, GALR 2005/2010 etc.).

In this chapter we try to capture the essence of the individuality of the grammatical thinking of the representatives of Cluj in the post-war period (the advised reader can immediately relate these concepts, ideas, hypotheses etc. to other interpretations from the current grammar).

Most formations are given in opposite pairs, highlighting thus the opposition not only between the members of the pairs, but also to other acceptations, some of them current.

For illustration, we will retain here only some of them: *syntagmatic agreement vs paradigmatic agreement, functions generator agreement vs agreement that does not generate functions, agreement in number and person vs identity in number and person, adherence vs juxtaposition, real apposition vs fake apposition, non-displaced verbal attribute vs displaced verbal attribute, primary grammatical categories vs secondary grammatical categories, case₁ vs case₂ vs case₃, casual complements vs casual circumstantials, univocal syntactic conditioning vs bi-univocal syntactic conditioning, relation flectives vs opposition flectives, primary casual flexions vs secondary casual flexions, mono-subordination vs double subordination, casual forms vs pro-casual forms, intra- vs extra-, primary casual non-flexion vs secondary casual non-flexion, desinential predicate vs intonational predicate, predicate vs pro-predicate, titular semi-independent pronoun vs duplicant semi-independent pronoun, să (to) – conjunction vs morpheme, relational senses vs non-relational senses, conditional phrases vs non-conditional phrases, intra-clause collocations vs inter-clause collocations, term vs member, blocked transitivity vs spent transitivity, unicity vs multiplicity etc.*

Among the formations that are not pairs, with trenchant, univocal acceptations we mention: *the time accusative, the adjectival, the nounal, the predicative adjoint, the verbal adjoint, the propositional adverb, the compedious apposition, the relational auxiliary, the contraction, the reduction, the decumulation of the relatives, the gramateme, the relateme, the syntactic monsters, the parenthetical, the subordination of the predicate to the subject, the pro-predicate,*

the syntactic relation, the non-existence of a conclusive subordination, the collocation (coordinative and subordinative), the \emptyset subject, the syntactic function, the multiplicity, the direction (sense) of the relation etc.

There are, definitely, other information that were not comprised here, but we studied these as we considered them relevant.

The horizon of knowledge, of new facts that we come in contact with by covering the works of these personalities determines us to assert that every single author may be the subject for research/study for many other PhD theses or specialty works that we are convinced we will encounter in the future.

Keywords: relation, syntagm, agreement, uniqueness, syntactic monsters, the Cluj relational neo-traditional School of Grammar

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	3
ARGUMENT.....	4
CHAPTER I. The Interwar Period.....	6
CHAPTER II. The Post-War Period.....	20
CHAPTER III. Grammarians.....	30
1. Mircea Zdrenghea	30
2. Cornel Săteanu	53
3. D.D. Drașoveanu	55
4. Ștefan Házzy	82
5. Viorel Hodiș	90
6. Gligor Gruită	95
7. Dumitru Bejan	108
8. G.G. Neamțu	111
9. Maria Vulișici Alexandrescu.....	138
CHAPTER IV. Glossary of Terms, Concepts, Ideas Used by the Philologists of Cluj	144
CHAPTER V. The Bibliography of the Authors Studied	171
CONCLUSIONS	200
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS	203
Contents	217