NOTES ON SUPPLETION IN THE CONTEMPORARY ROMANIAN LANGUAGE

DIANA-MARIA ROMAN[1]

ABSTRACT. *Notes on Suppletion in the Contemporary Romanian Language.*
Insofar as the meanings of suppletion are concerned, we should delineate two
working coordinates, both of which acknowledge the "total change of the radical":
the total variation of the root without affecting the flective (in the case of the
verbs a fi, to be, and a lua, to take), and the total variation of the root with the
absorption of the flective (in the case of personal pronouns proper and reflexive
pronouns), the lexemes becoming nonflexible. Once the absence of the flective is
accepted, gender, number and case are actualized in the form of non-flectional
grammatical categories, as proved, where possible, by its substitution, in the
given position, with a flexible pronoun and by the flectional syntagmatic
grammatical agreement of a flexible adjectival with these categories. When they
are subordinate terms, in the absence of a preposition/ prepositional phrase,
these lexemes are subordinated through the adherence-relateme.

*Key-words: suppletion, radical, total variation, inflection, flective, non-
flectional grammatical category*

REZUMAT. *Observaţii asupra supletivismului limbii române contemporane.*
În ceea ce priveşte accepţiunile supletivismului, trebuie delimitate două
coordonate de lucru având, ca notă comună, „schimbarea totală a radicalului":
variaţia totală a radicalului fără afectarea flectivului, în această situaţie, fiind
verbele *a fi şi a lua*, variaţia totală a radicalului cu absorbirea flectivului, situaţia
pronumelor personale propriu-zise şi reflexive, lexemele devenind neflexibile.
Odată acceptată absenţa flectivului, genul, numărul şi cazul se actualizează sub
forma categoriilor gramaticale aflectivale, dovada realizând-o, acolo unde se
poate, substituirea în poziţia dată cu un pronume flexibil, acordul gramatical
sintagmatic flectival al unui adjectival flexibil cu acestea. Când sunt termeni
subordonaţi, în absenţa prepoziţiei/locuţiunii prepoziţionale, respectivele lexeme
se subordonează prin relatemul-aderenţă.

*Cuvinte-cheie: supletivism, radical, variaţie totală, flexiune, flectiv, categorie
gramaticală aflectivală*

[1] "Babeş-Bolyai" University, Faculty of Letters, Cluj-Napoca, Horea Street, No. 31 E-mail:
deedee5891@yahoo.com

0. Introduction

This paper reopens the discussion concerning the meanings of *suppletion*, a fairly new concept (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 521) in Romanian scholarship that has been interpreted in several ways, all of these revolving around "the total change of the radical."

In this analysis, we start from the assumption that this phenomenon needs to be approached in altogether distinct manners, since, depending on the part of speech that "suffers from suppletion," a "change" is produced, with or without consequences from the point of view of the morphological classification of words (Coteanu, 1985, 93-94).

1. The meanings of *suppletion*

In both Romanian and foreign scholarship, suppletion generally receives two interpretations:

a. The term is defined *in terms of the total variation of the radicals*[2] of lexemes.[3] The opposite of this phenomenon is *partial variation*, marked by the existence of *phonetic alternations*,[4] in the sense that "in certain positions in the sequence of sounds representing the radical, there may appear distinct elements in different forms of the paradigm (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 369), while other phonic elements remain constant throughout the paradigm." (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 49)

Exemplifying this phenomenon in Romanian may be done:

a.1. Either by reference to the personal verb forms of the verbs *a fi* (to be) and *a lua* (to take): "As a rule*, the term *suppletion* entails a reference to the history of the word: the suppletive paradigm is the result of combining several distinct paradigms (*for instance, *a fi).* From a formal point of view, synchronically, the result of this entwinement of distinct paradigms is *the presence of totally different radicals in the inflection of a word*. In view of this feature, we consider that the verb *to take* is a suppletive[5] in contemporary Romanian, too, because*, even though it has a unique etymon for all its forms, it has entirely different radicals,

---

[2] For the opposition *radical* vs. *root*, see (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 421). See also (Constantinescu-Dobridor, 1998, 315).

[3] For the notion of "*lexeme"*, see (Neamţu, 2005a), words that, regardless of the level, intra-sentence (inside a sentence) vs. inter-sentence (between two sentences), can become terms in a relationship of subordination or coordination.

[4] For details regarding *phonetic-phonological alternations*, affecting both vowels and consonants in Romanian, see (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 40-41).

[5] As regards the class of verbs in Romanian, "no matter how much we enrich the list of examined verbs, we cannot increase the number of verbs with suppletive forms" (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 252).

such as *lu-* şi *ia-*." [emphasis ours] (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 49)[6] regarded as *verbs with a totally variable radical* (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 235).

a.2. Or by reference to personal pronouns[7] and the verb *a fi* (to be):

In general, as a common note, the term "designates a particular type of irregularity of the radical in the inflection," assuming that a paradigm contains more than one radical, derived from etymologically different roots (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 251).

Scholars acknowledge that actualizations of this phenomenon may occur, on the one hand, in the *nominal inflection*: "the personal pronouns *eu* (I), *mie* (me) have suppletive forms; these pronouns *stem from different roots even in Latin, thus perpetuating a primitive feature, derived from Indo-European*" [emphasis ours] (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 251), and on the other hand, in the *verbal inflection*. As regards the latter situation, the only example that is given is *a fi* (to be), "whose present indicative forms: *sunt* (I *am*), *eşti* (you *are*) also continue, perhaps, an archaic Indo-European pattern (compare them with the Latin forms *sum, es*), which Romanian made subject to analogies required by the evolution of its own system and to which it has added a third root, derived from the Latin frequentative *fieri*." (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 251)

b. The concept is defined in terms of the *radical's amalgamation with the flective*, so it entails, this time, "a complete change" of the whole word, with reference to personal[8] and reflexive pronouns: "*They constitute suppletive and/or irregular forms, in which the radical and the flective have merged, have become amalgamated. In fact, these forms were also suppletives in Latin, the language from which they are derived*." (Neamţu, 2014b, 268)

Considering that a structural description of these "lexemes" is "entirely uneconomical," the author proposes even abandoning any attempts to segment them morphemically: "Even where a segment of the radical is maintained in the course of the case inflection, *they do not lend themselves to a standard morphemic analysis, leading to aberrant flectives, unusual for any class of declinable words [...] It is therefore preferable to consider them all, whether they are stressed or not, as impossible to analyse from a morphemic perspective*." [emphasis ours] (Neamţu, 2014b, 267-268)

---

[6] These examples are also given in (Constantinescu-Dobridor, 1998, 150).

[7] Given the fact that, in the singular and the plural, the first and the second persons, the forms of personal pronouns are identical with those of reflexive pronouns; see (Neamţu, 2014a, 105-117). The reference includes these, too.

[8] The author makes reference only to first- and second-person pronouns, stating that pronouns in the third person, singular and plural, all of which are stressed forms, can be segmented and ascribed to normal pronominal inflection, see (Neamţu, 2014b, 267, subnote 27).

2. *Suppletion*: *between "lexeme" flexibility and non-flexibility*[9]

In most Romanian grammar treatises, the syntagm *grammatical category* is characteristically reduced to *flectional changes*, which is the *common note solely of grammaticalized categories*:[10] "Inflection is one of the most important aspects of the *relationship between content and form* in language." [emphasis ours] (Diaconescu, 1961, 163)[11]

Grammatical category becomes, thus, fully assimilable to inflection; it is inflection itself,[12] *marking "a change"*[13] *in the flective*, not in the radical: "A morphological process specific to a morphological type of languages: *flectional languages*, consisting in attaching to an invariable part of the word (= the radical, the one that provides the *lexical meaning or the lexical value*) one or more *grammatical affixes*[14] (i.e. the "variable constituent," (Iacob, 2002, 9), [15] *flectives*, in the "which various grammatical categories are manifested in the inflection of the words" (Hristea, 1984, 204), or the "*bearer or representative of grammatical categories*") (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 95) to mark various *grammatical categories*" (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 216) in speech. [emphasis ours]

In this context, "the description of a *paradigm* must *start from* the fundamental division between *the radical* and *the flective*." [emphasis ours] (Coteanu, 1985, 104) As a common note, regardless of their ontological content,[16]

---

[9] For a discussion on the concepts of *invariability* and *non-flexibility*, see (Roman, 2017a, 643-651).

[10] Certain studies propose the opposition "*flectional grammatical categories*" (= a category actualized in the flective of a part of speech) vs. "*non-flectional grammatical categories*" *(=* a category within the same flexible lexical-grammatical class that cannot be actualized in the flective with certain "lexemes" because of certain grammatical phenomena that generate its non-flexibility), see (Roman, 2017b, 782-792), (Roman, 2017c, 793-802).

[11] See also (Iordan, Guţu Romalo, Niculescu, 1967, 56), (Graur, 1973, 35), (Hristea, 1984, 201, 204), (Dimitriu, 1999, 36), (Iacob, 2002, 19), (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 94), (Pană Dindelegan, 2016, 5-6).

[12] In Romanian grammars, the term *inflection* is also known as *declension* and *conjugation*; what they have in common *is the actualization, at the expression level, of grammatical categories* that are specific to these two large classes of words: the substantival and the verb, see (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 131, 154), (Pană Dindelegan, 2016, 11).

[13] Once alternations are accepted as "*allomorphs of the radical*," see (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 53), they cannot be considered the *expression of inflection*, *hence, of grammatical categories*.

[14] For the *affix* and the opposition *derivative affix* vs. *grammatical affix*, see (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călăraşu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaş, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 33).

[15] See also (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 46-49), (Coteanu, 1985, 103-104), (Guţu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 16), (Pană Dindelegan, 2016, 3, 9-10).

[16] For a classification of the parts of speech in Romanian *from the ontological point of view*, see (Neamţu, 2005b).

flexible "lexemes" are automatically reduced, at the expression level, to their two components; in the absence of the latter component, they *cancel out their status as flexible words*.

After a foreign model,[17] in Romanian linguistics,[18] all units of expression become *morphemes* (Manoliu, 1963, 5), *a superordinate concept*, namely content, being useful for telling them apart: "From this point of view, we may distinguish *lexical morphemes*, in which, along with the root morphemes, derivative affixes are usually also included, and *grammatical morphemes*." [emphasis ours] (Iordan, Guţu Romalo, Niculescu, 1967, 51), a distinction that is still accepted today (Hristea, 1984, 204)[19].

By reference to the two parts of speech mentioned above, in approaching suppletion, several questions need to be answered, "in a cascade": *if there has been a change, where the change has occurred within the word, what part of the word has been affected* (only the radical or both the radical and the flective) and if this phenomenon has or not consequences for the flectional classification of "lexemes".

Interest is also motivated by the fact that there are two frequent different associations of the adjective *suppletive*,[20] which reveal, in fact, rather distinct situations:

a. *Suppletive form*, with reference to personal pronouns: "the personal pronoun retains an archaic, rather irregular inflection (Toma, Silvestru, 2007, 109), with numerous *suppletive forms*: for every person there are different roots for the plural and for the singular (*ego/nos; tu/vos*), or for the nominative and for the other cases (*ego/mihi/me*)." (Dimitrescu, 1978, 249)[21]

b. *Suppletive inflection*, with reference to personal and reflexive pronouns and to the forms of the verbs *a fi* (to be) and *a lua* (to take): "*Suppletive inflection* is a way to express grammatical relations not only through different endings or desinences, but also through different lexemes (the complete change of the word). For example: *sunt* (*am*), *eşti* (you *are*), *eram* (I *was*), *fusei* (I *had been*); *eu* (I), *mie* (to me), *mine* (me)..." [emphasis ours] (Găitănaru, 1998, 17)[22]

---

[17] See the meaning of morphemes proposed by *I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay*, in around 1880, with strong echoes especially in Soviet linguistics, see (Graur, 1957, 3), (Diaconescu, 1967, 91-92); for the significance given to the morpheme by J. *Vendryes*, see (Ionaşcu, 1953, 75-80), (Ionaşcu, 1957, 133-149), (Graur, 1957, 13), (Manoliu 1963, 5), (Iordan, Guţu Romalo, Niculescu, 1967, 46), (Diaconescu, 1967, 93).

[18] For an overview of the problems arising in attempts to delineate between the *lexical* and the *grammatical*, on the basis of different criteria, without arriving at accurate or fully satisfactory results, see (Manoliu, 1963, 3-15), (Manoliu, 1962, 89-102).

[19] See also (Pană Dindelegan, 2016, 10). For another point of view, see (Draşoveanu, 1997, 21-34).

[20] Other parts of speech that are considered *suppletive forms* are not treated; for example, possessive pronominal adjectives, see (Neamţu, 2014b, 457).

[21] See also (Constantinescu-Dobridor, 1998, 150), (Bărbuţă, Cicală, Constantinovici, Cotelnic, Dîrul, 2001, 105), (Irimia, 1997, 100, 105), (Pană Dindelegan, 2016, 105).

[22] See also (Iacob, 2002, p. 138).

2.1. Suppletion does not generate the non-flexibility of "lexemes"

Analysing the paradigm of the verbs *a fi* (to be) and *a lua* (to take), their radicals are, indeed, different, as follows: the verb *a fi* (to be) cumulates eight radicals, but, retaining the common note, *the initial*, only three radicals are accepted: I *sunt*, II *est-, eşt-, er-,* III *f-, fu-,*[23] *fi-, fos-* (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 252-253); applying the same principle, the verb *a lua* (to take) cumulates three radicals, only two having the same initial: I *ia-, ie-,* II *lu-* (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 253).

In the present indicative,[24] these lexemes can produce a "*bimorphemic flective" (*a flective composed of two typologically different flectional subunits): on the one hand, a *modal-temporal flective-suffix*, with negative actualization for the singular, in the first, second and third persons, for the plural, in the third person, as an expression of the flectional grammatical categories of mode and tense, and on the other hand, a desinence-flective, as an expression of the flectional grammatical categories of number and person, as follows: eu **sunt** – $\emptyset+\emptyset$ (I am), tu **eşti** – $\emptyset+i$ (you are), el/ea **este** – $\emptyset+e$ (he/she is), noi **suntem** – $e+m$ (we are), voi **sunteţi** – $e+ţi$ (you are), ei/ele sunt - $\emptyset+\emptyset$ (they are); eu **iau** – $\emptyset+u$ (I take), tu **iei** – $\emptyset+i$ (you take), el/ea **ia** – $\emptyset+\emptyset$ (he/she takes), noi **luăm** – $ă+m$ (we take), voi **luaţi** – $a+ţi$ (you take), ei/ele **iau** – $\emptyset+u$ (they take).

In the other tenses of the indicative, although the radicals of the verbs *a fi* (to be) and *a lua* (to take) are different from those of the indicative, they are constant. For example:

a. Simple perfect: eu fusei (I was)*, tu fuseşi* (you were)*, el/ea fuse* (he/she was)*, noi fuserăm* (we were)*, voi fuserăţi* (you were)*, ei/ele fuseră* (they were)*; eu luai* (I took)*, tu luaşi* (you took)*, el/ea luă* (he/she took)*, noi luarăm* (we took)*, voi luarăţi* (you took)*, ei/ele luară* (they took);

The morphemic structure of these lexemes implies the delimitation between the radical and the flective, the latter consisting of three flectional subunits and being, in other words, a "trimorphemic flective" (= a flective composed of three typologically different flectional subunits), composed of a modal-temporal flective-suffix, constant throughout the conjugation, with a positive actualization, -*se*-, a desinence-flective of number, with a negative actualization, $\emptyset$, only in the singular, in the first, second and third persons, but with a positive actualization, in the plural, in the first, second and third persons, -*ră*-, a *desinence-flective of person*, with a positive actualization in the

---

[23] "The simple perfect forms comprise the radical *f-* and those in which *fu-* appears are in free variation," for other details, see also (Guţu Romalo, 1968, 252-253).

[24] In Romanian, the present indicative and present conjunctive have homonymous forms in the singular and the plural, the first and the second persons; there are situations in which this homonymy can appear even in the singular and the plural, the third person: *el bea* (he drinks) → *el să bea* (he should drink), see (Pană Dindelegan, 2016, 259).

singular (with the exception of the third person, when it is Ø), *-i, -și*, in the plural (with the exception of the third person, when it is Ø), *-m, -ți* (Guțu Romalo, 1968, 161-163).

b. Past perfect: eu fusesem (I had been)*, tu fuseseşi* (you had been)*, e/eal fusese* (he/she had been)*, noi fuseserăm* (we had been)*, voi fuseserăţi* (you had been)*, ei/ele fuseseră* (you had been); *eu luasem* (I had taken)*, tu luaseşi* (you had taken)*, el/ea luase* (he/she had taken)*, noi luaserăm* (we had taken)*, voi luaserăţi* (you had taken)*, ei/ele luaseră* (they had taken).

The morphemic structure of these lexemes implies the delimitation of the radical and the flective, the latter consisting of four flectional subunits and being, in other words, a suffixal group, formed of two flectional subunits of the suffix type: "the form of the first element is always identical with the suffix of the perfect simple, while the form of the second, common to all verbs, is *–se-*." (Guțu Romalo, 1968, 164)

It is a desinential group composed of two flectional subunits of the desinence type: a desinence-flective of number, with a negative actualization, Ø, only in the singular, the first, second and third persons, with a positive actualization, in the plural, the first, second and third persons, *-ră-*, a desinence-flective of person, with a positive actualization in the singular (with the exception of the third person, when it is Ø), *-m, -și*, in the plural (with the exception of the third person, when it is Ø), *-m, -ți* (Guțu Romalo, 1968, 163-164).

At the expression level, the above-mentioned forms are *flexible*,[25] delineating a radical and a flective, each of these components suffering its own "change": within the *lexical morpheme*, as the *total variation of the radical*; within the grammatical morpheme, *flective*, depending on the members of mode, tense, number and person. That is why the right definition of this situation is the "total change of the radical" without affecting the flectives.

In general, regardless of mode and tense of the two verbs, we can identify a few general observations:

(1.) The syntagm *suppletive form* can be accepted, because, in Romanian, the *form* can entail both a *flexible form* and a *nonflexible form*, from the point of view of the morphological classification of words.

---

[25] With the exception of the perfect subjunctive (and, implicitly, the perfect presumptive, whose forms are homonymous with those of the perfect subjunctive). Regarding the perfect subjunctive, we must express our reluctance to consider that its forms are flexible, as they appear, rather, to be nonflexible forms, regardless of the actualized verb. At the same time, it remains ambiguous whether we may consider the imperative (a *personal* verbal form), in the singular, the second person, negative, as a form that is homonymous with the infinitive, (Guțu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 378-384). This refers to the fact that, except for the grammatical suffix, the desinence-flective of number and person is ostensibly non-existent. Otherwise, in the verbal inflection, no questions are raised about the demarcation of the flective from the radical.

Thus, *form* becomes a general, superordinate term. By contrast, the syntagm *suppletive inflection* [26] is clearly inappropriate: both concepts have a common feature, "change," their "place" in the "lexeme" being different: *inflection* is a "change" in the flective, depending on the grammatical categories that are actualized, while *suppletion* is "the total change of the radical," but without affecting the flective*.*

Thus, the two terms become incompatible, at the level of their association, each referring to a certain change of different components of the flexible "lexeme".

(2). The person is actualized as a *flectional grammatical category,*[27] whether syncretically realised,[28] alongside number, or individually realised, only in the personal verb forms. However, with a unique syntactic function, that of predicate, they actualize a "*flective-relateme"*[29] *of number and person*, by which they are subordinated to the head term, a substantival, in the Nominative.[30]

2.2. Suppletion generates the non-flexibility of "lexemes"

Generalizing, the *pronoun* is recognized as a part of speech, in the system of the Romanian language, which actualizes four categories that most researchers designate using the umbrella term of *grammatical* categories, *actualized within the flective*: gender, number, case and person (Guțu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 185).

In particular, there inevitably appears the opposition *personal pronouns* (personal pronouns proper, reflexive personal pronouns, and personal pronouns of politeness) (Guțu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 182), i.e. pronouns which also actualize

---

[26] Inflection is also associated with other words: *synthetic inflection* vs. *analytical inflection*, *nominal inflection* vs. *verbal inflection*, *substantival inflection* vs. *adjectival inflection* vs. *pronominal inflection*, *case inflection*, etc., the meanings of these collocations being very different; for details, see (Iordan, Guțu Romalo, 1967, 66-67), (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călărașu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaș, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 216-217), (Neamțu, 2014b, 249-269).

[27] The recognition of the *person as a grammatical category of personal verb forms is widely accepted*, see (Stati, 1967, 138), (Lyons, 1995, 315-316), (Neamțu, 2014b, 448, subnote 29, 315).

[28] *Syncretism* is used in the following sense: the actualization of more than one grammatical category within a *flectional unit/subunit*, see (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călărașu, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mancaș, Pană Dindelegan, 2005, 479).

[29] On the "*relateme"*, see (Drașoveanu, 1997, 21-44); "any phrase segment used as a means of achieving a syntactic relation, either of the connective type (prepositions, conjunctions, relative pronouns, etc.), or of the flectional type (desinence-flective, article-flective, etc.)", see (Neamțu, 2014b, 381, subnote 4). "Flective-relateme" is the expression of a relational flectional grammatical category or of a subtype of intra-sentence subordination, see (Roman, 2017d, 61-62).

[30] For a full discussion of the relation between subject and predicate according to the *Cluj School Grammar, of a neo-traditional, relational orientation*, see (Drașoveanu, 1997, 49-50, 86-87).

the person, vs. *non-personal* or *a-personal pronouns*,[31] which do not actualize the person (Pană Dindelegan, 2016, 99).

Regarding the actualization of *all* the categories of personal and reflexive pronouns, many researchers unequivocally state that, in spite of the fact that they call them grammatical categories, the *oppositions between the members of these categories occur between lexemes*; this implicitly suggests that such words cannot release flectives: "[...] *suppletion, which means that, in a small number of words, grammatical categories are the result of a change in the radical, and not in the flective* [...], for the first-person, singular personal pronoun, the nominative form is *eu* (I), and the dative form is *mi* (me)." [emphasis ours] (Dimitriu, 1999, 33); "In the case of suppletive flectional forms, *grammatical categories are not marked by grammatical morphemes, but by the total change of the radical; in this case, lexical morphemes carry the entire grammatical information*: *eu-noi* (I-we)*, eu-mie* (I-to me)*, tu-voi* (sg. you - pl. you) ..." [emphasis ours] (Iacob, 2002, 12);

Within this working perimeter, we can draw the following observations:

(1) At the expression level, "lexemes" are nonflexible,[32] *the reason why it is impossible to segment them into the radical and the flective being suppletion itself*,[33] a concept used, actually, in its second meaning, according to which "the total change of the radical" encompasses the whole word, affecting the flective, too.

Hence, the two components can no longer be differentiated, the flective being totally absorbed and, therefore, non-existent. The reverse of this point of view cannot be taken into account, i.e. these words cannot be considered exclusively grammatical morphemes, or flectives, because the lexical morpheme cannot have zero realisation.[34]

The radical of pronouns "suggests, in mediated form, a lexical meaning" (Neamțu, 2014b, 428) that is, in the communication situation, expressed by the noun, its referential source, substituted in the given position.

---

[31] The two concepts appear in free variation; for example, *non-personal pronouns*, see (Guţu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 182), *a-personal pronouns*, see (Neamțu, 2014b, 456, subnote 25).

[32] For the sake of uniformity, we can accept that all these forms of personal pronouns, regardless of person and number, stressed or unstressed form, are in this situation. Indeed, if the flective is recognised for the stressed forms of the third person (especially in the case of Genitive/Dative forms, with the specific endings *-ui, -ei, -or*), then they must be considered flexible forms, and gender, number and case are flectional grammatical categories.

[33] For the reason behind the *non-flexibility* of some lexemes in parts of speech that are considered, in general, flexible, see (Roman, 2017b, 782-792), (Roman, 2017c, 793-802).

[34] The *radical* is characterized by four complementary features: compulsory presence, bearer of lexical meaning, non-admission of zero realisation, constant element of the paradigm, see (Coteanu, 1985, 104).

Ultimately, morphemic segmentation involves *regularization*, *simplicity* and *economy* (Coteanu, 1985, 107), all the more so as the aim is to facilitate the study of words, not to hinder it (Dimitriu, 1999, 232-233).

The acceptance of these forms as non-segmentable[35] can be motivated by the fact that their number is small, "lexemes" being reduced in quantity, in opposition, for example, with the large class of nouns/adjectives, the other pronominal pronouns/adjectives or even the class of verbs.

(2) In the absence of the flective, as an expression of flectional grammatical categories, after the already existing model in the case of other "lexemes" *declared* to be nonflexible but belonging to flexible parts of speech, the following questions inevitably arise: if categories are, still, actualized; if they are recognized, what is their status at the expression level; which would be the manner of subordinating these words as subordinate terms?!

(2.1) At the expression level, the person of personal pronouns proper and of reflexive personal pronouns,[36] unlike the person of Romanian verb forms, cannot be actualized in the flective: "*The lexical realisation of the category of person in pronouns makes it unlikely that we can consider it as a category of inflection, be it suppletive, along with gender, number and case.*" (Neamțu, 2014b, 457)[37] That is why the author calls them "*words with a lexical indicator of person.*" (Neamțu, 2014b, 457)

Thus, it remains doubtful if we can regard the person a grammatical category with actualization through suppletive forms, because *eu, tu, el* (I, you, he), etc. are independent, different words rather than forms of the same paradigm,[38] i.e. forms of one and the same word (Neamțu, 2014b, 438, 457),[39] especially since, in the case of any paradigm, there must exist *a basic, dictionary form* (Neamțu, 2014b, 457).

(2.2.) These "lexemes" have the grammatical categories of the whole class (gender, number and case), but they are *actualized only in the non-flectional form*, *so they are "non-flectional grammatical categories"*, the

---

[35] There are authors who have attempted the *morphemic segmentation* of all of these forms, see (Pavel, 1963, 199-207), (Florea, 1964, 438-439). The latest such proposal, considered by other scholars to be "non-economical," is the one advanced in Guțu Romalo, 2005, see (Guțu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 200), which no longer appears as a working option in Pană Dindelegan 2016.

[36] In fact, the same situation applies to the person of all the personal pronouns and of possessive and emphatic pronominal adjectives.

[37] However, the latest academic treatises consider that the person of personal pronouns is a grammatical, hence, an inflectional category, see (Guțu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 185), (Pană Dindelagan, 2016, 100).

[38] In fact, by accepting only three persons, see (Guțu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 194-212, 222-232), it is obvious that we are talking of three paradigms in the case of personal pronouns proper and of reflexive pronouns.

[39] See also (Graur, 1972, p. 194), (Drașoveanu, 1997, 197).

oppositions being realised between different "lexemes".[40] This reality is confirmed by the phenomenon of grammatical agreement, both paradigmatic and syntagmatic,[41] as follows:

a. "Non-flectional paradigmatic grammatical agreement"[42]

With the general recognition of the pronoun as a substitute,[43] "the pronoun does not designate, but takes the place of something that is designated," having "a mediated notional sense" (Neamțu, 2014b, 282), this part of speech – as "*Acordant$_p$*" or *concording element* (a status the pronoun has when it is not Tr (= the head term in an intra-sentence subordinative syntagm) for an adjectival or for a personal verb form), alongside the numeral with a pronominal value[44] – is in *paradigmatic grammatical agreement* with the noun, an "*Acordat$_p$-S*"[45] (*concorded element*), the only part of speech with which paradigmatic agreement can be achieved in Romanian.

From the point of view of the content, the noun has four *deictic categories d.1.* (Roman, 2016a, 337) which can occur in the following hypostases, at the expression level: flectional grammatical categories, number, case, determination, a lexical-semantic category, gender.[46]

The categories of the pronoun (gender, number and case),[47] at the level of the whole class, as a common note, from the point of view of content, are *anaphoric categories a.1.*,[48] taken over from the noun, through this subtype of agreement, and *represented* by the pronoun in the same position.

Depending on the pronominal subclass and depending on the flexible or nonflexible character of the lexemes pertaining to them, paradigmatic

---

[40] Obviously, there are cases of homonymy both for the stressed forms – gender – *eu, tu, noi, voi* and for the unstressed forms – *le* –. *Lor **le**-am dat un telefon* (I gave **them** a call). (Dative, gender – masculine, feminine).

[41] For the opposition *paradigmatic* agreement vs. *syntagmatic* agreement, see (Gruiță, 1981, 11-28).

[42] For the *flectional* vs. *non-flectional* types of paradigmatic grammatical agreement and of syntagmatic grammatical agreement, see (Roman, 2017b, 789-790), (Roman, 2017c, 799-800).

[43] For the pronoun as *substitute*, see (Zrenghea, 1970, 126), (Gruiță, 1981, 18), (Hristea, 1984, 227), (Neamțu, 2014b, 438).

[44] For the pronominal value of the numeral, see (Pană Dindelegan, 2003, 77-85).

[45] For the distinctions *concorded element* vs. *concording element* and other subdivisions dependant on the morphological value, see (Roman, 2016a, 338-345), (Roman, 2016b, 247-249).

[46] For the reality of the gender of Romanian nouns as a "*lexical-semantic category*", see (Roman, 2016c, 27-43).

[47] There can be no agreement between any part of speech and the noun in the category of determination, either paradigmatically or syntagmatically. That is why it has been called an "*absolute category*", a category pertaining solely to the common noun, see (Roman, 2016b, 245-252).

[48] For the opposition *deictic categories* vs. *anaphoric categories, deictics d.1. vs. anaphorics a.1. vs. anaphorics a.2.,* see (Roman, 2016a, 336-338).

grammatical agreement can be either: *flectional*, anaphoric categories a.1. actualized within the flective, or *non-flectional*, anaphoric categories a.1. actualized outside the flective, hence, in the radical.

Thus, if at the level of the content, *the same categories* retain their status of anaphoric categories a.1., at the expression level, *the same categories* can appear in two hypostases, depending on the lexemes to which we refer: "*flectional grammatical categories*" vs. "*non-flectional grammatical categories*".

Personal pronouns proper and reflexive pronouns have only the non-flectional type of paradigmatic grammatical agreement:[49] ***Te**-aş chema la mine, dar nu am timp.* (I'd invite **you** over, but I have no time.)/*Oare **ţi**-am spus că nu mai lucrez acolo.* (Did I tell **you** that I don't work there anymore?)/*Să **ne** spui şi **nouă** când vrei să iniţiezi proiectul.* (Let **us** know when you want to start the project.)/***S**-a supărat pe noi, deşi nu are motive.* (She got mad at us, but for no reason.)

If they are replaced with any other pronouns, flexible, in this case, wherever it is possible,[50] the paradigmatic grammatical agreement is actualized in a flectional manner: ***Lor** le-am trimis un pachet.* (It is **to them** that I sent a package.) → ***Unora/acelora/fiecărora** le-am trimis un pachet.* (It is **to some/ those/everyone** that I sent a package.[51]

b. "Non-flectional paradigmatic grammatical agreement and flectional syntagmatic grammatical agreement"

Within these two *simultaneously actualized* subtypes of agreement, there may appear personal pronouns proper and reflexive pronouns, with stressed forms, representing the part of speech that *mediates* the transfer of categories from a deictic hypostasis d.1. into an anaphoric hypostasis a.2.,[52] in the sense that they have in their suborder either an adjectival type of determinant, or a determinant of the verb type, a personal verb form.

In this situation, the pronoun appears in a twofold manner, depending on the role fulfilled within the agreement and the type of agreement involved: "*concording element*" vs. "*concorded element*": as „*Acordant$_p$*" (it is a part of speech that enters *paradigmatic agreement*) and as "*Acordat$_s$*" (it is a part of speech with which *syntagmatic agreement is made*).

---

[49] These "lexemes" cannot change their grammatical value from pronouns into pronominal adjectives, as it happens in general.

[50] Only the stressed forms of the third person can be substituted with another pronoun; these forms are, obviously, a-personal, in the given position. In the other cases, the substitution can be operated, but it is compulsory that the personal verb form should be changed, through a shift from the first and second persons to the third person.

[51] For an examination of these flexible forms, see (Guţu Romalo, 2005, Vol. I, 243-288).

[52] For the recognition of this *mediation*, see (Gruiţă, 1981, 18-19).

A further evidence of the existence of non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1. in these pronouns is the syntagmatic flectional grammatical agreement of the "*Acordant$_s$*" (that is, flexible "lexemes" from the adjectival category)[53] with them.

The parts of speech that can occupy the position of an "*Acordant$_s$*" with these pronouns that appear in a twofold quality can be:

b.1. "*Acordant$_p$=Acordat$_s$-P.p.pr.z*" *(personal pronouns proper)* – gender, number, case *(non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1.)* → "*Acordant$_s$-Adj.pr.z.*" *(adjectives proper)* – gender, number, case *(flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2.),* the adjective fulfilling the following syntactic functions actualized by the flective-relateme of gender, number and case*:*

b.1.1. *Predicative in the Nominative: Eu sunt* **simpatică***./Tu eşti* **simpatică***./El este* **simpatic***./Ea este* **simpatică** (I am **nice**./You are **nice**./He is **nice**./She is **nice**)*;*

b.1.2. *Predicative adjunct:*[54]

b.1.2.1. *Predicative adjunct in the Nominative: Eu ascult* **atentă** *lecţia, dar nu înţeleg nimic./Tu asculţi* **atentă** *lecţia, dar nu înţelegi nimic.* (I am **carefully** listening to the lesson, but I can't understand anything./You are **carefully** listening to the lesson, but you can't understand anything.)*;*

b.1.2.2. *Predicative adjunct in the Accusative:* **Pe mine** *m-au găsit mai* **liniştită** *decât mă lăsaseră./***Pe tine** *te-au găsit mai* **liniştită** *decât te lăsaseră.* (They found **me calmer** than they had left me./ They found **you calmer** than they had left you.)[55]

b.2. "*Acordant$_p$=Acordat$_s$-P*" (personal pronouns proper and reflexive pronouns) – gender, number, case (*non-flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.1.*) → "*Acordant$_s$-Adj.p.î.*" (emphatic pronominal adjective) – gender, number, case (*flectional grammatical anaphoric categories a.2.*), fulfilling the syntactic function of adjectival attribute with the stressed forms of personal pronouns proper and reflexive pronouns, a function carried out through the flective-relateme of gender, number and case: **Eu însumi** *credeam*

---

[53] For the *adjectival class*, see (Draşoveanu, 1997, 21, subnote 2).

[54] For the name, see (Neamţu, 2005a).

[55] *Pe* is considered a preposition in these situations, see (Guţu Romalo, 2005, Vol. II, 378). For the flective *pe*, see (Draşoveanu, 1997, 107-112).

*cu totul altceva despre ideile lui năstruşnice. / **Mie însumi** mi-a spus cu totul altceva atunci când ne-am întâlnit.; Ai citit Gânduri către **sine însuşi**?* (**I myself** had thought something entirely different about his crazy ideas./She told **me** something else when we met./Have you read **To Himself**?)

b.3. *"Acordant$_p$=Acordat$_s$-P.p.pr.z."* *(personal pronouns proper)*[56] – number (*non-flectional grammatical anaphoric category a.1.)→ "Acordant$_s$-Vb.p."* (verb in a personal verbal form) – number (*non-flectional grammatical anaphoric category a.2.*)*,* appear as stressed forms, as subjects in the Nominative: ***Eu** te-**aş** mai **suna**, dar **tu nu** îmi **răspunzi** la telefon niciodată./**Noi** v-**am** mai **căuta**, dar **voi** vă **lipsiţi** de prieteni când aceştia sunt la necaz.* (**I'd call** you again, but **you** never **answer** my phone*./* **We'd call** you again, but **you can do away** with your friends when they are in trouble.)

(2.3.) If the *suppletive form* has the same interpretation as above, the syntagm *suppletive inflection* is not inappropriate here either, but the explanation is different: not having a flective and, hence, inflection, "the total change of the radical" covers the whole length of the words, so inflection cannot be suppletive as long as there is no inflection.

(2.4.) The effect of the non-flexibility generated by *suppletion* is the manner of subordinating these words, when they appear in a *structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function*,[57] within which we can distinguish only two situations, depending on the absence/presence of a preposition/prepositional phrase:[58]

(2.4.1.) *Structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function in the presence of the "preposition-relateme"*: occupying such a position, like any substantival, regardless of the morphemic status of lexemes, *flexible* vs. *nonflexible*, or like any other part of speech that can occur in the

---

[56] Having only forms of Accusative and Dative, reflexive pronouns cannot appear as Tr for a personal verb form, so they cannot appear as subjects.

[57] For the delineation of syntactic positions as *structural* vs. *non-structural*, with the relevant subcategories, see (Neamţu, 2005a).

[58] For the two instances of the preposition/prepositional phrase, "*preposition-relateme*" (= the preposition (prepositional phrase) becomes a *relateme subtype* when it appears in a relational hypostasis, i.e. when it accompanies a "lexeme" found in a structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function) vs. "*preposition-opposeme*" *(*= the preposition (prepositional phrase) becomes an *opposeme subtype* when it appears in a non-relational hypostasis, i.e. when it accompanies a lexeme in a non-structural position of the apposition type.), see (Roman, 2016d, 7-25). For "*opposeme*", see (Neamţu, 2005a), any phrase segment either of the connective type (prepositions,), or of the flectional type (desinence-flective, article flective) when it appears in a non-relational hypostasis, i.e. when it accompanies a "lexeme" in a non-structural position of the apposition type.

presence of a preposition, non-personal verb forms, adverbs, interjections, lexemes are subordinated through the *preposition-relateme*.

(2.4.2.) *Structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function in the absence of the "preposition-relateme":* occupying such a position, like any nonflexible part of speech, the "*adherence-relateme*" (= "the zero expression of the "*relateme*", or simple juxtaposition", a subtype of "*relateme*" that is specific to non-flexible "lexemes" of the adverb and interjection types, (Neamțu, 2014b, 396)), the only means of subordination.[59]

Conclusions

The two meanings discussed in this paper, having as a common feature the *total change of the radical*, should be applied differently, *depending on the part of speech referred to*: in the case of the verb forms *a fi* (to be) and *a lua* (to take), *suppletion involves the total change of the radical*, *without affecting the flective*; in the case of personal pronouns proper and of reflexive pronouns, without exceptions, *suppletion involves a total change of the radical, absorbing the flective, hence, eliminating it, the lexemes in question becoming automatically nonflexible*.

Personal pronouns proper will actualize the grammatical categories of gender, number and case specific to the entire class of pronouns only in the *non-flectional hypostasis*, unlike the verb forms of the "lexemes" *a fi* (to be) and *a lua* (to take), which will actualize their categories of mode, tense, number and person in the flectional hypostasis.

As regards the morphological value of pronouns, the same categories, namely gender, number and case, appear in a double hypostasis, *flectional* vs. *non-flectional*, reinforcing the opposition between "*flectional grammatical categories*" and "*non-flectional grammatical categories*".

Pronominal "lexemes" placed in a structural position of the type part of sentence and syntactic function are subordinated exclusively through two subtypes of "*relateme*": the "*preposition-relateme*" and the "*adherence-relateme*", the latter replacing, in fact, "*the case flective-relateme*" (=a flectional grammatical category of case in a relational hypostasis, or the expression of a relationship of intra-sentence subordination), specific to the flexible substantival.[60]

---

[59] For different details about the concept, as well as for the emergence of this manner of subordination in the nominal group, see (Roman, 2017b, 787-789).

[60] For the *substantival*, see (Drașoveanu, 1997, 21, subnote 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BĂRBUŢĂ Ion, CICALĂ Armenia, CONSTANTINOVICI Elena, COTELNIC Teodor, DÎRUL Alexandru, *Gramatica uzuală a limbii române*, Chişinău, Editura Litera, 2001.

BIDU-VRĂNCEANU Angela, CĂLĂRAŞU Cristina, IONESCU-RUXĂNDOIU Liliana, MANCAŞ Mihaela, PANĂ DINDELEGAN Gabriela, *Dicţionar de ştiinţe ale limbii*, Bucureşti, Editura Nemira, 2005.

CONSTANTINESCU-DOBRIDOR Gheorghe, *Dicţionar de termeni lingvistici*, Bucureşti, Editura Teora, 1998.

COTEANU Ion (coord.), *Limba română contemporană. Fonetica. Fonologia. Morfologia*, Ediţie revizuită şi adăugită, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1985.

DIACONESCU Paula, *Un mod de descriere a flexiunii nominale, cu aplicaţie la limba română contemporană*, in SCL, XII, Nr. 2, 1961, pp. 163-192.

DIACONESCU Paula, *Evoluţia noţiunii de morfem şi stadiul actual al analizei morfematice*, in Elemente de lingvistică structurală, redactor responsabil Coteanu Ion, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1967, pp. 90-112.

DIMITRESCU Florica (coord.), *Istoria limbii române*, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1978.

DIMITRIU Corneliu, *Tratat de gramatică a limbii române. Vol. I: Morfologia*, Iaşi, Institutul European, 1999.

DRAŞOVEANU D.D., *Teze şi antiteze în sintaxa limbii române*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Clusium, 1997.

FLOREA Viorica, *Despre flexiunea pronominală*, in LR, XII, Nr. 5, 1964, pp. 437-453.

GĂITĂNARU Ştefan, *Gramatica actuală a limbii române. Morfologia*, Piteşti, Editura Tempora, 1998.

GRAUR Alexandru, *Note asupra structurii morfologice a cuvintelor*, in SG, Vol. II, 1957, pp. 3-18.

GRAUR Alexandru (coord.), *Introducere în lingvistică*, Ediţia a III-a revizuită şi adăugită, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1972.

GRAUR Alexandru, *Gramatica azi*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1973.

GRUIŢĂ G., *Acordul în limba română*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1981.

GUŢU ROMALO Valeria, *Morfologie structurală a limbii române (substantiv, adjectiv, verb),* Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1968.

GUŢU ROMALO Valeria (coord.), *Gramatica limbii române. I. Cuvântul, II. Enunţul*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

HODIŞ Viorel, *Articole şi studii. I. Relaţia de echivalenţă (Logic-Semantic-Sintactic)*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Risoprint, 2006.

HRISTEA Theodor (coord.), *Sinteze de limba română*, Ediţia a III-a revăzută şi din nou îmbogăţită, Bucureşti, Editura Albatros, 1984.

IACOB Niculina, *Morfologia limbii române*, partea I, Suceava, Editura Universităţii Ştefan cel Mare, 2002.

IONAŞCU Alexandru, *Despre structura cuvântului, morfeme*, procedee gramaticale, in LR, II, Nr. 4, 1953, pp. 75-81.

IONAŞCU Alexandru, *Morfemul şi structura morfologică a cuvântului*, in SCL, VIII, Nr. 2, 1957, pp. 133-149.

IORDAN Iorgu, GUŢU ROMALO Valeria, NICULESCU Alexandru, *Structura morfologică a limbii române contemporane*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1967.

IRIMIA Dumitru, *Gramatica limbii române*, Iaşi, Editura Polirom, 1997.

LYONS John, *Introducere în lingvistică teoretică*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1995.

MANOLIU Maria, *Morphèmes lexicaux et gramaticaux*, in CLTA, I, 1962, pp. 89-102.

MANOLIU Maria, *Morfemul în lingvistica modernă*, in LR, XII, Nr. 1, 1963, pp. 3-15.

NEAMŢU G.G., *Curs de limba română contemporană, Sintaxă*, Facultatea de Litere, Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai", Cluj-Napoca, 2005-2006, 2005a.

NEAMŢU G.G., *Curs de limba română contemporană, Morfologie*, Facultatea de Litere, Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai", Cluj-Napoca, 2005-2006, 2005b.

NEAMŢU G.G., *Teoria şi practica analizei gramaticale, distincţii şi… distincţii* (cu trei seturi de grile rezolvate şi comentate), Ediţia a IV-a, revăzută, adăugită şi îmbunătăţită, Piteşti, Editura Paralela 45, 2014a.

NEAMŢU G.G., *Studii şi articole gramaticale*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Napoca Nova, 2014b.

PANĂ DINDELEGAN Gabriela, *Elemente de gramatică. Dificultăţi, controverse, noi interpretări,* Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas Educational, 2003.

PANĂ DINDELEGAN Gabriela (coord.), *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, Ediţia a II-a, Bucureşti, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2016.

PAVEL Toma, *Morfologia pronumelui personal în română*, in SCL, XIV, Nr. 2, 1963, pp. 199-207.

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *Numărul numeralului românesc, o categorie deictică d.1. de tip lexico-semantic, şi implicaţiile sale în ceea ce priveşte acordul paradigmatic şi sintagmatic*, in Studii de filologie. In honorem Ştefan Găitănaru, coord. Soare Liliana, Sămărescu Adrian, Dumitru Adina, Piteşti, Editura Universitatea din Piteşti, 2016a, pp. 335-346.

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *Opposition groups relative vs absolute categories in Romanian*, in Convergent Discourses. Exploring the Contexts of Communication. Language and Discourse, Editori Boldea Iulian, Buda Dumitru-Mircea, Târgu Mureş, Editura Arhipelag XXI Press, 2016b, pp. 245-253

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *Noun Gender in Romanian, a Lexical-Semantic Category*, in Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty LUMEN, Secţiunea Philosophy and Humanistic Siences, Vol. 4, Nr. 1, 2016c, pp. 27-43.

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *The Preposition-Opposeme of the Romanian Substantival Non-sT*, in Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty LUMEN, Secţiunea Philosophy and Humanistic Siences, Vol. 4, Nr. 1, 2016d, pp. 7-25.

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *Invariable and/or non-flexibile words?!,* in JRLS, Nr. 10, 2017a, pp. 653-661.

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *The Adherence-Relateme of the Romanian Proper Adjectives*, in JRLS, Nr. 11, 2017b, pp. 782-792.

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *The Content and Expression of the Gender of the Romanian Cardinal Numeral*, in JRLS, Nr. 11, 2017c, pp. 793-802.

ROMAN Diana-Maria, *„Relaţia”: identitatea unei şcoli de gramatică*, in Identităţi ficţionale şi practici discursive, Editor Parpală Emilia, Craiova, Editura Universitaria, Bucureşti, Editura ProUniversitaria, 2017d, pp. 56-65.
STATI Sorin, *Teorie şi metodă în sintaxă*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1967.
TOMA Ion, SILVESTRU Elena, *Sinteze de limba română. Actualizări teoretice şi aplicaţii*, Bucureşti, Editura Niculescu, 2007.
ZDRENGHEA Mircea, *Limba română contemporană-morfologia* (curs litografiat), Cluj-Napoca, 1970.