

**BABEȘ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY, CLUJ-NAPOCA**  
**FACULTY OF LETTERS**

**THE CATEGORIES OF THE NOMINAL GROUP – DEICTIC  
AND ANAPHORIC, NON-FLECTIONAL AND FLECTIONAL**

**-PhD thesis-**

**ABSTRACT**

**Supervisor:**

**Emeritus Prof. dr. G.G. NEAMȚU**

**PhD student:**

**Diana-Maria ROMAN**

**2016**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Introduction

### Part I

#### Chapter 1. Between definitions and classifications of the parts of speech

1.0. Development stages of the parts of speech. General features

1.1. The period of *Greek-Roman Antiquity*

1.2. The European *Middle Ages*

1.3. The *Renaissance*

1.4. Linguistics in the 19th century

1.5. The 20th century and structuralism

Conclusions

### Part II

#### Chapter I. Reconsiderations of the phrase “grammatical category” in the Romanian language

1.0. The content and form of the nominal group categories

1.0.1. The form of the nominal group categories

1.0.2. The content of the nominal group categories

1.1. The deictic categories d.1. of the nominal group

1.1.1. The deictic categories d.1. of nouns – gender, number, case and determination

1.1.2. The deictic category d.1. of personal pronouns, reflexive pronouns, politeness pronouns, and possessive and intensive pronominal adjectives – person

1.1.3. The deictic category d.1. of cardinal and ordinal numerals – number

1.2. The anaphoric categories of the nominal group

1.2.1. The anaphoric categories a.1. of the nominal group

1.2.2. The anaphoric categories a.1. of the nominal group

1.2.3. The anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group

Conclusions

#### Chapter 2. The deictic categories d.1. of a *lexical-semantic type* of the nominal group

2.0. The deictic categories d.1. of a lexical-semantic type of the nominal group

2.0.1. The gender of nouns

2.0.2. The person of personal pronouns, reflexive pronouns, politeness pronouns, and possessive and intensive pronominal adjectives

2.0.2.1. The person of personal and reflexive pronouns

2.0.2.2. The person of personal politeness pronouns

2.0.2.3. The person of possessive pronominal adjectives

2.0.2.4 The person of intensive pronominal adjectives

2.0.3. The number of cardinal and ordinal numerals

**Conclusions**

**Chapter 3. The *flectional grammatical* deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group. Flectional typologies**

3.0. The flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group

3.0.1. The flectional typology of the flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. of the nominal group

3.0.1.1. The flectional typology of the flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. of the nominal group in the absence of definite and indefinite determination

3.0.1.2. The flectional typology of the flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. of the nominal group in the presence of definite and indefinite determination

3.0.2. The flectional typology of the flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group

3.0.2.1. The flectional typology of the flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. of the nominal group

3.0.2.1.1. The flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. of pronouns

3.0.2.1.2. The flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. of cardinal and ordinal numerals with a pronominal value

3.0.2.2. The flectional typology of the flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2. of the nominal group

3.0.2.2.1. The flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2. of the qualifying adjective

3.0.2.2.2. The flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2. of the pronominal adjective

**Conclusions**

**Chapter 4. The flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group. Between *morphological flectional grammatical categories* and *syntactical flectional grammatical categories***

4.0. The flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group. Between *morphological flectional grammatical categories* and *syntactical flectional grammatical categories*

4.0.1. The morphological flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. of the nominal group

4.0.1.1. The morphological flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. of a *non-Ts*

4.0.1.1.1. The morphological flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. of a *non-Ts* of the Vocative type

4.0.1.1.2. The morphological flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. of a *non-Ts of the apposition type* in the presence and in the absence of the *preposition-opposeme*

4.0.1.1.3. The morphological flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric

categories a.1. of a *non-Ts of the subject type*

**4.0.1.2.** The morphological flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. of a *Ts achieved through a preposition-relateme*

**4.0.2.** The morphological flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of a *Ts in the absence of the preposition-relateme*

**Conclusions**

## **Chapter 5. The non-flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group**

**5.0.** The non-flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group

**5.0.1.** The non-flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. of the nominal group

**5.0.2.** The non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2 of the nominal group

**5.0.2.1.** The non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. of the nominal group

**5.0.2.2.** The non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2. of the nominal group

**5.0.2.2.1.** The non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2. of the qualifying adjective

**5.0.2.2.2.** The non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2. of the pronominal adjective

**5.0.2.2.3.** The non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2. of the cardinal numerals with adjectival value

**5.0.3.** A new means of subordination in the nominal group – the *adherence-relateme*

**Conclusions**

## **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

### **GLOSSARY**

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **JOURNAL TITLE ABBREVIATIONS**

**Keywords:** lexical-semantic category, flectional grammatical category, non-flectional grammatical category, deictic category d.1., anaphoric category a.1., anaphoric category a.2., flectional and non-flectional paradigmatic grammatical agreement, flectional and non-flectional syntagmatic grammatical agreement (concord), concurring element, concorded element, flectional and non-flectional grammatical syncretism, paradigmatic and syntagmatic selection restriction, intralexematic redundancy, intrasyntagmatic redundancy, absolute category, relative category, flective-relateme, preposition-relateme, adherence-relateme, flective-opposeme, preposition-opposeme, structural position, nonstructural position, lexeme.

Unlike many controversial issues in Romanian morpho-syntax that generated, quite rightly, most of the times, an avalanche of theoretical reactions from grammar scholars situated on different positions, with reference to either morphological values (for example, the status of the article – is it or is it not a part of speech, is it or is it not a flective of the category of determination or is it *both and*; the status of the numeral, is it or is it not a self-standing lexical-grammatical class, individualized as such among the vast remainder of parts of speech with a lexeme status within the system, and what would be the limits to which we should relate when we approach that part of speech) or to the level of syntactic functions (for example, the predicative adjunct), the categories

of the nominal group – gender, number, case, person, determination (the categories of comparison and/or intensity, of the order of numerals are not treated), appear to be devoid of major controversy, at a first glance, against this background. Indeed, with the exception of the category of the case, perhaps, the most polemicized category in European grammar, regardless of the linguistic school/current/doctrine in which it was debated, or of some members of the categories – the neuter gender, for example, in the Romanian language – on the one hand, is or is not the third member of the category of gender in nouns, on the other hand, is or is not the third member of the category for the entire nominal group, the acceptance/non-acceptance of the vocative as a member of the category of case in a given system, the acceptance/non-acceptance of the non-determination category, as the third member of the category of determination, these categories have been regarded with less interest by researchers, who have limited themselves to brief and scattered approaches over time. At present, in Romanian Linguistics and beyond, there is no substantial/dense study, either of the monographic or of the contrastive type, that can provide, even in general terms, a solid analysis as regards the categories of gender, number, case and person, either in particular terms, in the sense of examining a single category, or in general terms, at the level of the entire system of specific categories mentioned above, which represent, in fact, the “core of debate” in this PhD Thesis.

At the same time, what should also be taken into account are a few other essential coordinates which outline and support, with arguments, from an original perspective, the title of this research – *The Categories of the Nominal Group – Deictic and Anaphoric, Non-flectional and Flectional*. From a didactic point of view, given that, at a general level, both in the Romanian and in the foreign bibliography, the terms employed around the nominal group categories are very well known and frequently used both in the pre-university and in the university environment, a possible conceptual refinement becomes a priority when the accuracy of grammatical information in the classroom and in research is taken into account. On the other hand, the recognition of certain schools of grammar, in the academic milieu, is becoming a genuine, pertinent “scientific challenge.” In fact, a new approach to grammar was “inaugurated” in Cluj many years ago: a *relational neo-traditional approach*, with a highly particularized specificity, vehemently set forth by two well-known academics, Professor *D. D. Drașoveanu*, the originator of this analytical model, and Professor *G. G. Neamțu*, a faithful continuator of the former, especially at the level of understanding and using the system, within a terminological framework that may be new for the other university centres. Professor *Giglor Gruiță* belongs to the same School of Grammar: he outlined with detailed nuances, for the very first time, the concepts of paradigmatic agreement vs. syntagmatic agreement in the specialized literature.

This type of grammar is individualized, within the general context of the entire Romanian grammar system, along the contours given by the definition of relations, the linguistic sign representing the solidarity between form and content, more specifically, a linguistic entity in syntagmatic terms, targeting both coordination and subordination at the intrapropositional and intrapropositional levels. Thus, two words with the lexeme status acquire the status of terms in the presence of the relation, in the context of a syntactic structure that must by all means be binary, called a syntagm. Addressing the nominal group and its categories, this PhD Thesis approaches, by the force of things, only subordination and only at the intrapropositional level.

In all the bibliographic materials we have explored, references are made, in the form of arguments and counterarguments, to statements that appear in a very large number of grammatical treatises, articles and studies (369 works), representing the result of the research undertaken in this area prior to the publication of GLR 1963 and until the year 2016, works written both in Romanian

and in foreign languages, by many already consecrated authors, from different universities – Cluj-Napoca, Iași, Bucharest: *Lucia Wald, Sorin Stati, Dumitru Irimia, Valeria Guțu Romalo, Iorgu Jordan, Maria Manoliu Manea, Viorel Hodiș, Gabriela Pană Dindelagan, D.D. Drașoveanu, G.G. Neamțu, Alexandru Graur, Ion Coteanu, Corneliu Dimitriu, Mioara Avram, Paula Diaconescu, Gligor Gruîță, Mircea Zdrenghea, etc.* Some of these have been studied in the minutest of details (*Lucia Wald, Sorin Stati, D.D. Drașoveanu, G.G. Neamțu, Valeria Guțu Romalo, Gligor Gruîță, Maria Manoliu Manea, Paula Diaconescu Mircea Zdrenghea, etc.*), making reference to almost the entire corpus of works produced by these researchers.

At the level of content organization, our study outlines, from one end to the other, theoretically, two lines of analysis: the first part is limited to a single chapter, while the second part is visibly more consistent and dense, in terms of both the bibliographical resources used and of the problematical issues addressed. The second part is much larger, comprising five major chapters, each of which delineates another substantial series of subchapters, focusing on the concrete study of what we may call the categories of the nominal group in the Romanian language, both at the level of the content, referring to the ontological content of the part of speech in which the category concerned is actualized, and at the level of the form, compulsorily at the same time.

In part I, the first chapter, *Between definitions and classifications of the parts of speech*, outlines a succinct overview of the manner in which the specific parts of speech of the nominal group and not only have become individualized over time, charting different approaches and classifications of these lexical-grammatical classes: nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals, etc., implicitly also of grammar, as a science and as an object of study, ever since the Greek-Roman Antiquity and up to the time of the structuralist trend. They emerged and developed gradually, along with the development of language and thought, passing through several stages of evolution: the lexical differentiation of the vocabulary into parts of speech, but only based on the syntactic function, a stage in which formal indicators of any kind continued to be absent in words, languages being in an isolating stage; the second stage, the most evolved, derived from functional differentiation, was marked by formal distinctions, at the level of the form of the parts of speech.

This section briefly outlines the first conceptual approaches to grammatical categories, from names, definitions, members and/or number of members, etc. Many of the researchers presented succinctly here, beginning with *Plato, Aristotle, Dionysius Thrax, Apollonios Dyskolos*, continuing with *Marcus Terentius Varro, Remmius Palaemon, Aelius Donatus, Priscianus, Thomas de Aquino, Nebrija, Petrus Ramus, Charles Butler, C. Lancelot, A. Arnauld, Hermann Paul, B. Croce, Henry Sweet, L. Hjelmslev, Edward Sapir, J. Vendryes, A. Meillet, Eugenio Coșeriu*, etc. endeavoured, by and large, to identify a unique and relevant criterion. A unique criterion has not been applied even in the Romanian works on this subject, by reference to the Romanian language; three fundamental criteria have been delineated, representing, in fact, an evident constant: lexical meaning (or semantic = what is expressed), the characteristics of form (the type of inflection) and syntactic function, the order being aleatory and varying from one author to another.

The impossibility of such an approach is apparent from the start, rightly so, because of the fact that these classes of words are non-homogeneous and non-unitary. That is why we must accept that it is impossible to capture, simultaneously, a pertinent demarcation and to separate them on the basis of different criteria, which are nonetheless necessary and complementary, enabling them to become individualized as such. Some of the authors we have studied consider that it is dangerous to legitimize one to the detriment of another, each of the criteria applied over the course of time being consistent with grammatical conceptions that are specific to a given period or another. The

definition and classification of the parts of speech should take into account, firstly, the ontological criterion, an approach that obviously has many consequences for the recognition, definition and classification of the categories within the system of a language.

In Part II, the first chapter, *Reconsiderations of the phrase “grammatical category” in the Romanian language*, starts from a highly controversial discussion, “as the starting point for the whole work”, which draws attention to the fact that all of the nominal group’s categories must be analysed, simultaneously, from two fundamental viewpoints: content and form; these coordinates must be related, clearly, to each and every category of the part of speech included here. In terms of form, categories can be, at the level of the whole nominal group: lexical-semantic, implicitly non-flectional, vs. grammatical; grammatical categories will be subdivided into flectional grammatical categories vs. non-flectional grammatical categories. Thus, designating all of them as grammatical categories, as all the specialized bibliography does, in fact, becomes an inopportune and unjustified claim. The parts of speech in the nominal group can have: only flectional grammatical categories; or only non-flectional grammatical categories, or both lexical-semantic categories and flectional grammatical categories; or both lexical-semantic categories and non-flectional grammatical categories. The combination between flectional and non-flectional grammatical categories is never possible. The importance of knowing the status of a category from the standpoint of form becomes fundamental given that all flectional grammatical categories can appear, generally speaking, in two significant situations: morphological flectional grammatical categories vs. syntactic flectional grammatical categories.

In terms of content, at the level of the entire nominal group, lexical-semantic, flectional and non-flectional grammatical categories can be: a. deictic categories of the type d.1. – those that have their own content, deicticity being organized at the level of the form either in lexical-semantic, implicitly non-flectional manner, or in flectional or non-flectional grammatical manner; b. anaphoric categories: b.1. anaphoric categories of the type a.1. – those that acquire an intermediated content, *as representation in the absence of the noun in whose position there appears, as a result of the paradigmatic grammatical agreement, either a flectional, or a non-flectional one*; b.2. anaphoric categories of the type a.2. – those that have no content, but refer, *by repetition, as a result of the syntagmatic grammatical agreement, be it flectional or non-flectional, to the content of certain categories of the deictic type d.1., of certain categories of the anaphoric type a.1. in whose presence they are*; as regards the latter opposition, note should be taken of the common note: grammatical agreement.

Grammatical agreement in the Romanian language must be analysed from two angles: on the one hand, from the vantage of *concording categories* – those that form the agreement, on the other hand, from the vantage of *concorded categories* – those with which the agreement is formed. By reference to concording categories, anaphoric categories draw three essential directions, also generating, in fact, and three subtypes of agreement: parts of speech which actualize anaphoric categories a.1. as a result of the flectional and non-flectional paradigmatic agreement, these representing exclusively deictic categories d.1. in the same position in which the part of speech featuring deictic categories d.1. may appear; parts of speech which actualize anaphoric categories a.2., as a result of the flectional and non-flectional syntagmatic agreement, these repeating both deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1., either simultaneously or alternately; parts of speech which actualize both anaphoric categories a.1. and anaphoric categories a.2., as a result of the paradigmatic agreement and of the syntagmatic agreement, both being achieved simultaneously.

Grammatical agreement, be it paradigmatic, syntagmatic, paradigmatic and syntagmatic,

actualize two essential hypostases at the level of the form: flectional, when the *represented concurring categories* and the *repeated concurring categories* are flectional grammatical categories; non-flectional, when the *represented concurring categories* and the *repeated concurring categories* are non-flectional grammatical categories. None of the deictic categories d.1. of the lexical-semantic type can enter agreement (either paradigmatic or syntagmatic), in any hypostasis (either flectional or non-flectional), as they exclusively have the status of concorded category, hence a category with which agreement can only be made, irrespective of this agreement.

At the level of the flectional and non-flectional paradigmatic and syntagmatic agreement, the number of concurring categories, hence, of the categories with the status of anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2., has a maximum number of categories – three – gender, number, case, represented and/or repeated, and a minimum number of categories – two – gender and case, represented and/or repeated, the latter situation applying to cardinal numerals, collective cardinal numerals and, with certain exceptions, ordinal numerals.

An immediate consequence of the statement above is the fact that the numerals of the Romanian language do not agree in number with any part of speech in the nominal group: on the one hand, the numeral cannot agree paradigmatically, either in flectional or in non-flectional manner, with the noun, in its *concorded* hypostasis, on the other hand, it cannot agree syntagmatically, either in flectional or in non-flectional manner, with the noun or the pronoun, as the only parts of speech in the hypostasis of concorded elements for these numerals. In this direction, a solution of interpretation is offered: the *selection restriction* that we detail, at the level of the content, along two strands (it is not limited to what is outlined in the specialized bibliography of the Cluj School of Grammar): on the one hand, we propose a dichotomy that is contingent on two levels – paradigmatic and syntagmatic – *paradigmatic selection restriction vs. syntagmatic selection restriction*, a dichotomy that affects, in fact, two objective linguistic realities, depending on the plan to which we relate – the numeral does not select, either on the paradigmatic or on the syntagmatic level, another part of speech with which it is in paradigmatic or syntagmatic agreement only if that part of speech is either singular or plural; on the other hand, we extend the concept, on the syntagmatic level, also to the possibility of a Tr to have a subordinate Ts in a particular number, not only in subordination – as a Ts, the numeral cannot have a subordinated Ts from the nominal group unless the respective value actualizes either only the singular or only the plural, through syntagmatic grammatical agreement.

By reference to the concorded categories, we can delineate the following subtypes of grammatical agreement: paradigmatic deictic agreement d.1., syntagmatic deictic agreement d.1., anaphoric syntagmatic agreement a.1., paradigmatic and syntagmatic deictic agreement d.1., deictic paradigmatic agreement d.1. and syntagmatic anaphoric agreement a.1.

The status of *irradiant*, which is the nominal group, in the case of the Romanian language system, should not be limited solely to nouns, as has been the case up to the present moment, because it is not only this part of speech that has deictic categories d.1. which can be passed on (hence, concorded categories), either by representation, or by repetition, to other parts of speech in the nominal group, but also cardinal numerals, collective cardinal numerals and ordinal numerals with pronominal value, and personal, reflexive, politeness pronouns that have such a category; in the first case, we are talking about number, while in the second case, about person; in the case of the noun there is a maximum number of three categories – gender, number, case; determination does not have the status of a concorded category.

In the Romanian language, in the class of the substantival and the adjectival, but also in the area of the verb, there are certain categories – the flectional grammatical category of



determination, in the case of the noun, mode and tense, in the case of personal and non-personal verb forms, which cannot have the status of either a concurring or a concorded category, called, in this PhD Thesis, *absolute categories*, which pertain exclusively to the ontological content of those parts of speech, in opposition to the rest of the categories that can occupy those hypostases, called *relative categories*, i.e. the categories that can have both the status of a concorded category and the status of a concurring category.

The second chapter, *The deictic categories d.1. of a lexical-semantic type of the nominal group*, offers a new approach to the deictic categories d.1. of gender, number and person (the only ones in the nominal group) related exclusively to certain lexical-grammatical classes, in which these categories are actualized lexically-semantically, and implicitly non-flectionally, hence, outside the flective, in the radical and/or root, judging by the evidence of things, in all the lexemes that can have the following morphological values: the gender of nouns, the person of personal, reflexive and politeness pronouns, of possessive and intensive pronominal adjectives, the number of cardinal, collective cardinal and ordinal numerals. These categories with a non-grammaticalized content for the parts of speech concerned, in all the lexemes considered here, have succeeded in grammaticalizing it in other lexical-grammatical classes in the Romanian language system: gender is a mandatorily flectional grammatical category (sometimes also non-flectional) in pronouns, pronominal adjectives, qualifying adjectives, some cardinal numerals, all collective cardinal and ordinal numerals, regardless of their values; person is a mandatorily flectional grammatical category (sometimes also non-flectional) in personal verb forms, regardless of their type; number is a mandatorily flectional grammatical category (sometimes also non-flectional) in nouns, qualifying adjectives, pronouns or pronominal adjectives.

Suppletion, a concept known and used in linguistics, especially in the sphere of personal pronouns, which can be associated, from the point of view of many scholars, with the flexible, that is, suppletive inflection, as a sort of inflection subtype, deserves increased attention: on the one hand, this is a term that should be applied both to forms in paradigms that have a diachronic explanation, through a different etymon, and to forms in paradigms that, diachronically, have a common etymon at their basis; on the other hand, suppletion, regardless of the part of speech in which it occurs, can be related only to the following situations, whose common note is, in fact, the radical and/or the root, as modification, as change: different radicals with flectives, as flexible lexemes, which can actualize a flective, as a bearer of grammatical meaning, within the same paradigm, a flectional paradigm; different radicals, without flectives, within the same paradigm, this time, a non-flectional paradigm. The opposition of the members of the category of person in pronouns and pronominal adjectives which they know in the hypostasis of a lexical-semantic deictic category d.1. cannot suggest suppletion, the oppositions being achieved between different lexemes belonging to different paradigms, regardless of their type, either flectionally, in the case of possessive and intensive pronominal adjectives, or non-flectionally in the case of personal, reflexive and politeness pronouns.

The third chapter, *The flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group. Flectional typologies*, analyses, for the first time in the specialized bibliography, the flectional typology of the form of the flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1., of the anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2., retaining thus the common note – the actualization of these categories within the flective, regardless of its type – synthetic or analytical.

First, as a defining and general aspect for the entire nominal group, inflection (the flective) characterizes the Romanian language, regardless of the formative-structural aspect of flexible

words (i.e. words with flectives): be they primary, derivative or compound, their formal behaviour being unable to overcome the dichotomy flexible (flectional) vs. non-flexible (non-flectional), but directly dependent on the class of words in which they can enter (we are referring here to the aspect of lexical-grammatical or categorized derivation and to that of grammatical or converted derivation).

In the analysis we have conducted in our research, we have taken into account the following features of the flective of flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and those of the flective of flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2., as follows: flectional typology, the structure of the flective, flectional grammatical syncretism (as opposed to non-flectional grammatical syncretism in all those situations in which the lexemes considered to be non-flexible in the nominal group actualize two or three non-flectional grammatical categories), the phenomenon of redundancy, delineated along two essential coordinates: intralexematic redundancy and intrasyntagmatic redundancy.

As regards the flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2., in general, of the nominal group, they are materialized in the following flectional units and/or subunits: *flective-desinence*, *flective-determinative article (definite and indefinite)*, *flective-case and number article*, *flective-pronominal and numeral formative article*, flective-deictic particle, flective-affix of gender and case, the term flective being generic, supraordinate. The motivation underlying this defining or inventorying manner pertains to their common note as the first term of compound nouns, because they are all, in fact, materializations of the flective, albeit different in terms of their form and role; hence, the need for a second term of the unwelded compound word. The choice of the term “article” for all the situations listed above finds its explanation in a common note, too: formally, they are all articles, the difference consisting in the role they fulfil.

The structure of the flective of the flexible parts of speech of the nominal group – the respective morphological values can actualize, in general, either a monomorphematic flective, reduced to only a flectional unit, or a bimorphematic flective, consisting of maximum two flectional subunits (the dichotomy flectional unit vs. flectional subunit is grounded in the fact that the flective may coincide or not with the desinence, the determinative article, pronominal and numeral formative, of case and number, the deictic particle, the gender and case affix), never more at once, the bimorphematic flective always actualizing the flective-desinence on the first position, as the first flectional subunit.

The concept of syncretism is understood in this PhD Thesis solely as in the sense in which it proposes the actualization of more than one flectional grammatical category in the context of a flectional unit and/or subunit, divided, depending on the flectional structure, into primary syncretism (in the case of a monomorphematic flective, the flective coinciding with the flectional unit, regardless of its type) and secondary syncretism, as a second syncretic flectional grammatical manifestation (in the case of a bimorphematic flective, both flectional subunits actualizing in syncretic flectional grammatical manner certain flectional grammatical categories, depending on the morphological value to which we relate).

As regards the phenomenon of redundancy, we propose a demarcation between intralexematic redundancy (the redundancy within the flexible lexeme, by necessity releasing a bimorphematic flective) and intrasyntagmatic redundancy (in the case of a repetition within a binary syntagm, consisting of two different flexible morphological values – adjectival and verbal intrasyntagmatic redundancy, as the sole possibilities in the system of the Romanian language).

The fourth chapter, *The flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric*

*categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group. Between morphological flectional grammatical categories and syntactical flectional grammatical categories, confirms, more than ever, the existence of three levels that are specific to the Romanian language: phonetic, lexical and grammatical, the latter being delimited solely in didactic terms into morphological vs. syntactic, the flectional form of the deictic categories d.1., of the anaphoric a.1. and a.2. categories (hence, only of the flectional grammatical categories) being the common note, but also a somewhat “neutral” state, which, depending on the syntactic position in which lexeme occurs, knows only two situations: a morphological flectional grammatical category vs. a syntactical flectional grammatical category.*

The syntactic positions of the Romanian language must accept the following dichotomy: structural syntactic positions vs. non-structural syntactic positions. Structural syntactic positions are, in turn, of two types: part of sentence, but never syntactic function – the subject, words with the status of lexemes that may appear in such contexts representing non-Ts; part of sentence and syntactical function – any of the following: complement, circumstantial, attribute, predicative, predicate, predicative adjunct, the words with the status of lexemes that may appear in such contexts representing Ts. Non-structural syntactic positions are of only two types, either of the vocative or addressative type, or of explanatory type - the appositive type, the words with the status of lexemes that may appear in such contexts representing non-Ts.

The parts of speech that occur in a non-structural position of the appositive or explanatory type may or may not be accompanied by prepositions or prepositional phrases having the status of preposition-opposeme, with the observation that they retain their case regime, imposing to the part of speech in the substantival class that are post-positioned to them one of the three possible cases, alternately – accusative, dative, genitive, unlike the substantival accompanied by a preposition/prepositional phrase that is actualized in a structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactical function having the status of preposition-relatemes. Thus, in the Romanian language, the preposition and the prepositional phrase can occur in two entirely different situations: as relateme vs. opposeme, delineating the dichotomy preposition-relateme vs. preposition-opposeme.

Flectives, as the expression of flectional grammatical categories, regardless of their content, be it deictic d.1., anaphoric a.1. or a.2., may know or may be individualized under two hypostases, just like prepositions/prepositional phrases: as a relateme (as the expression of a/some syntactic grammatical category/categories, vs. as an opposeme (as the expression of a/some morphological grammatical category/categories), with the observation that, sometimes, the same unit of form, be it a flectional unit or a flectional subunit, can represent the materialization of both a morphological and a syntactic flectional grammatical category, a phenomenon that is explainable precisely given the syncretism of the Romanian language.

In the opposition morphological hypostasis vs. syntactic hypostasis, the flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a. 1. and a. 2. can appear as follows: the only parts of speech of the nominal group that can actualize only syntactic flectional grammatical categories are those included in the adjectival class, mandatorily situated on a structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function in the absence of the preposition-relateme, these syntactic functions being marked flectionally, through the flective-relateme of case, number and gender or gender and case (anaphoric a.2.). The only parts of speech of the nominal group that can actualize flectional morphological grammatical categories are those included in the substantival class, mandatorily situated on a structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function in the presence of the preposition-relateme, of the type part of

sentence, but never syntactic function – subject, on a non-structural position of the vocative type and of the appositive type. The only parts of speech of the nominal group that can actualize both morphological and syntactical flectional grammatical categories are those classified/classifiable under the substantival category, mandatorily situated on a structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function, in the absence of the preposition-relateme, syntactic functions achieved flectionally through the flective-relateme of case – deictic d.1. and anaphoric a.1.

In the Romanian language, flective-relatemes are limited, within the nominal group, only to the following subtypes: flective-relateme of case, flective-relateme of gender, number and case, flective-relateme of gender and case. By reference to the content of syntactical flectional grammatical categories, they can be divided into: deictic d.1. flective-relatemes of case – only for the morphological value of nouns; anaphoric a.1. flective-relatemes of case – only for the values of morphological values of pronouns and cardinal numerals (a part), collective cardinals and ordinal numerals with a pronominal value; anaphoric a.2. flective-relatemes of gender, number, case – only for qualifying, pronominal adjectives, some ordinal numerals with adjectival value, anaphoric a.2. flective-relatemes of gender and case – only for cardinal numerals (a part), collective cardinals, and ordinal numerals with an adjectival value.

In contrast, retaining the note of the flective-relateme and the flective-opposeme, flectional marking or flectional actualization, the flective-opposeme is limited within the nominal group solely to the following subtypes: flective-opposeme of number and case (when the noun is not determined), flective-opposeme of number, case and determination, flective-opposeme of gender, number and case, flective-opposeme of gender and case. By reference to the content of morphological flectional grammatical categories actualized in the flective-opposeme, they can be divided into: deictic d.1. flective-opposeme of case and number (when the noun is not determined), deictic d.1. flective-opposeme of case, number and determination (when the noun is determined, definite or indefinite), deictic d.1. flective-opposeme of number (when the noun is not determined), deictic d.1. flective-opposeme of number and determination (when the noun is determined, whether definite or indefinite), anaphoric a.1. flective-opposeme of gender, number, case, anaphoric a.1. flective-opposeme of gender and number, with the observation that the flective of an adjectival can never be a flective-opposeme.

Thus, two essential dichotomies for the nominal group are highlighted: on the one hand, the flective-relateme and the preposition-relateme, on the other hand, the flective-opposeme and the preposition-opposeme. Through the first component of the unwelded compound noun, we may retain the common note: in the case of the former opposition, the presence of syntactic meaning, and in the case of the latter, the absence of syntactic meaning. Through the second component, we may retain the differentiating note: the presence of syntactic meaning is materialized either at the level of the flective or at the level of preposition/prepositional phrase; the absence of syntactic meaning is materialized either at the level of the flective or at the level of the preposition/prepositional phrase.

The fifth and last chapter, *The non-flectional grammatical deictic categories d.1. and anaphoric categories a.1. and a.2. of the nominal group*, focuses the discussion around a concept that is very well known in the specialized bibliography – invariability, delineated along two significant and, implicitly, different levels: partial invariability vs. total invariability.

In all the parts of speech of the nominal group there appear lexemes recognized from a lexical-grammatical point of view as nouns, pronouns, qualifying and pronominal adjectives, cardinal numerals (about which it has been argued, very often and for a long time, that they are invariable or that they have the status of invariable words, a viewpoint that is nuanced ever more

pertinently in recent specialized studies, especially when the parts of speech concerned are the noun and the adjective and, especially, since the introduction of neological structures into the Romanian language system). In fact, at present the Romanian language presents no visible signs of any tendency at all towards maintaining the utter and complete invariability of certain lexemes pertaining to the Romanian system, upholding a “position”, in this regard, that is identical to that of 60 years ago, for example, since the inventory of the lexemes declared to be invariable has remained the same throughout time.

From the standpoint of what the concept of invariability means, we have retained only two directions that totally relaunch the problem as regards the assimilation between the terms invariable and non-flexible, the two terms being utterly different. In fact, their invariability can be partial, within a flectional paradigm, or total, within a non-flectional paradigm, as follows:

On the one hand, the partial invariability of the words with the lexeme status within the nominal group represents an invariability only in respect of one or maximum two flectional grammatical categories from the possible total number of categories that the part of speech in question can actualize (but never an invariability at the level of all the flectional grammatical categories that the morphological in question can actualize), generating the phenomenon of partial homonymy, and is reduced to a flectional form, releasing thus a flective that, on the basis of an undeniable reality of the Romanian language – flectional grammatical syncretism – will also actualize the other flectional grammatical categories whose content is not marked at the level of form.

On the other hand, the total invariability of words with the status of a lexeme in the nominal group, as well as of those outside of it represents, in fact, an invariability at the level of all the flectional grammatical categories those words could actualize (we are referring here to the morphological values of the nominal group), generating the phenomenon of total homonymy, implicitly also the non-flexibility of the word; however, it cannot materialize these categories in a marked manner, so the content in question will vary depending on the context in which it appears. The discharge of a flective, after the model of the other parts of speech, is not, from our point of view, a functional mechanism, because the flective “does not say,” information-wise, more than it would if it weren’t accepted.

The non-flexibility of the Romanian language should be examined, at the level of the entire system of Romanian grammar, along two fundamental working coordinates:

As regards the words with the status of lexemes that have been considered, up to this point, to be non-flexible, their status is pertinent, evidently, as long as they do not have or cannot have any flectional grammatical category from among those that the Romanian language has as possibilities within the morphological value in which they appear integrated.

As regards the possibility that this phenomenon could also occur in the nominal group, it should be noted that their status as non-flexible words is generated or can be generated by several phenomena: total invariability, suppletion in the case of certain parts of speech, oppositions between the lexemes of different flectional paradigms, the result being self understood: the words will not generate a flective, the words can or cannot actualize certain grammatical categories flectionally.

However, due to the fact that these morphological values are perfectly integrated in the system in terms of their functioning, we cannot assert or argue that these lexemes do not have categories at all, but we can affirm that they will actualize them in a non-flectional manner, outside the flective, hence, in the radical and/or root, the proof of their existence being the paradigmatic flectional grammatical agreement, the syntagmatic flectional grammatical agreement, the

phenomenon of the unmarked conversion of certain morphological values, so that the same word, with the same form, may represent more than one lexical-grammatical class; in these situations we find, on the one hand, non-flexible pronouns and their correspondent non-flexible pronominal adjectives, and on the other hand, non-flexible cardinal numerals with a pronominal and adjectival value.

Once these parts of speech in the nominal group are accepted as non-flexible, having, by the force of things, non-flectional grammatical categories, one can no longer get into discussion the possibility that these morphological values, as Ts, hence, as syntactic functions can represent syntactic grammatical categories, hence, as flective-relatemes, their means of subordination, in the absence of the preposition-relateme, being adherence.

Once these coordinates of the PhD Thesis are accepted, it should be noted that, at the intrapropositional level, in the nominal group, the means of subordination are reduced to three: the flective-relateme, the preposition-relateme, the adherence-relateme.

The PhD Thesis ends with a consistent glossary that operates with an innovative conceptual and terminological apparatus at the level of the entire research, using, on the one hand, certain already consecrated terms, which are deemed to be “sensitive” to some extent and whose content is supplemented or restricted, depending on the needs, sometimes through the addition of new terms, just as well known, at other times through the proposal of new terms.

