SYNOPSIS
PhD Thesis

Coordination and Subordination – a Logical – Linguistical Approach

Scientific Coordinator
Em. Prof. PhD PETRU IOAN

PhD Student
ROXANA-IULIANA (POPESCU) PASCU

2013

CONTENTS OF THE THESIS

This thesis, entitled *Coordination and Subordination – a Logical – Linguistical Approach,* aims at identifying the interest of linguistics and logic for defining coordination and subordination, as logical - linguistic phenomena. The purpose of this thesis is to prove that there is an adequate common framework related to the description of the syntactic relations between sentences in language and that there are completions/adjuncts of some nuclei of a sentence which follow the logical structure of subject and predicate (verb). Therefore, the concept of "sentence" is limited to refer to a multiple sentence, either compound (for coordinated clauses), either *complex* (both clauses subordinated to words in the sentence and coordinated subordinate clauses). Particularly, this thesis introduces the situations in which subordinated clauses are part of the nominal group or of the verbal group, as complements of the noun or verb considered the nuclei of the expressions bearing the same name, and building correct sentences leads to an organized and coherent discourse. The concept of "predicate"[1] has proven to be central, so that the subject itself becomes an argument of the predicate. The logical - linguistic cohesion and coherence of a text is necessary for understanding the message sent by a locutor to an interlocutor, who, on the basis of the formation and transformational rules, is able to produce, in his/her turn, appropriate sentences from a syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and logical point of view.

In *Chapter 1, Logical – linguistical benchmarks,* we presented language as an object of study of both fields as well as several similarities between logic and linguistics which are realised by intersecting syntax and with semantics. Syntax represents an infralogic form of language involved in the construction and communication of judgments. In addition, it also comprises the relationships which are established between sentences, and not just relationships linking words in sentence. Therefore, syntax also contributes to the formation of reasonings.

The grammatical correction rules are complementary to those related to the logical validity ones, all being meant to enable the intelligibility of the inter-communicable messages, but they do not overlap and they are not subordinated one to another. The proof is that there are people who express themselves with many grammatical errors (either in their mother tongue or in an insufficiently practised foreign language), but flawless from a logical point of view; on the other hand, there are instances when, using impeccable grammatical forms, there can be logical errors sometimes subtle, other times really disturbing.

---

[1] In English, the concept of 'predicate' is also known as 'verb'

4

The grammatical and logical syntax resemble one another in terms of *FORM* in which content is presented, *RULES* for forming clauses / sentences, respectively judgements / reasoning, *CORRECTNESS* related to syntactic rules on the one hand, and to logical implication, on the other hand and *BIVALENCY* (applying correct / incorrect dichotomy, respectively true / false) and *RELATIVE INDEPENDENCE OF FORM RELATED TO CONTENT,* however, the syntactic correctness still depending on the logical-semantic one.

The categorial grammar represents the syntactic method to (re)construct logic. Therefore, syntax represents the most abstract level of reconstruction and awareness of the language of logic which ignores both the objects for which signs are substituted, as well as the subject who uses the signs. If we do not consider the users of signs, focusing on the objects, then logic could be reconstructed by means of the semantic method.

Rebuilding logic at the syntactic level involves the construction of an artificial language, strictly formal. Thus, words in natural language must be replaced by conventional signs (*symbols*) and must set up a number of rules (formation and of transformation) in order to obtain correct expressions which to be derived within the framework of the system, thus forming demonstrations purely formal (*formalisation*).

Different applications of logic in linguistics demonstrate the fact that there is an attempt to find a grammatical logic and a logical grammar. Philosophers such as Gotlob Frege, Bertrand Russell, Edmund Husserl, Alfred Tarski, Rudolf Carnap, representatives of the Polish School, Jean Piaget, and others, as well as linguists represented by Richard Montague, Noam Chomsky, Leonard Bloomfeld, Eugeniu Coşeriu, Gheorghe Ivănescu and others have tried to explain subordination and coordination of terms by logical means that simplify the comprehension of the intra- and interpropositional relationships.

Therefore, we mention in the sub-section 1.3 the *validity theory, the meaning theory* and *the structure theory* as theories which have been brought into linguistics clarifications both in terms of the truth of sentences which requires the introduction of relations (not referential) of sentence meaning of the sentence expressions and the extralinguistic entities, both from the point of view of the expression saturation with the help of another expressions, in anticipation of the linguistic discrimination between *adnominal* (that completes a noun) and *adverbial* (that completes a verb).

By following logical structure, subject and predicate, a sentence is composed, as a result, of two parts, in the context of the syntagmatic analysis, that is to say immediate constituents: the *NOMINAL GROUP* (GN)

and the *VERBAL GROUP* (GV). The sentence with its constituents is assimilated with a categoric judgement, 'a is b' type, which must be reduced to the type of the name and the subject clauses; the predicate includes the subject complement, direct / indirect object, time, modal, quantity, successive, final adverbials, etc.

As a result, there are no longer subordinated sentences, but only sentences in the form of terms. Terms of *adnominal* and *adverbial* represent the modern concept of subordination, and the co-ordination and the subordination at the level of sentence are just relations of some sentences that are part of a sentence developed.

In order to explain the coordination and subordination relationships, in Chapter 2, *Levels of Analysis of the Phenomena of Coordination and Subordination,* we defined and listed types of dependency and coordination according to the level of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analysis, but also reported to the logical categories. Thus, these phenomena can be explained by the notion of *nucleus / periphery* at the sentence level, by the *symmetry / asymmetry* dichotomy at the semantic level, by reference to *hierarchy / non-hierarchy* at the discourse level or by the logical categories of *arguments / functors* from a formal point of view.

Coordination and subordination can be reconsidered in terms of semiotics, following the hexadic model applied to syntax. There are identified *SIX TYPES OF SYNTAX* within the framework of which we could be approach the phenomena of coordination and subordination of fundamental logical categories (notions / sentences): ☞1^0 *SYNTAX OF THE SIGNIFICANT*; ☞ 2^0 *SYNTAX OF MEANINGS*; ☞ 3^0 *SYNTAX OF INTENSIONS;* ☞ 4^0 *SYNTAX OF THE ILLOCUTIONS;* ☞ 5^0 *SYNTAX OF PERLOCUTIONS;* ☞ 5^0 *SYNTAX OF THE POSSIBLE LOCUTORS, ACTANTS OR NARRATION*. At the intersection of these types of syntax cohesion and coherence can be found, which offers a well-formed speech from all points of view.

The connectors are treated in subsection 2.3 in contrast between natural language and logic. Conjunctions express semantic relations between the units which connects them, reflecting the speaker's perspective on the connection between the de facto states in the world. For the theoreticians of the coherence, connector link up to two units of speech, usually understood as two consecutive sentences. The theoreticians of pertinence, on the other hand, connectors relate an assertion and a context or contextual effects. To reach the same interpretation, the speaker must process the utterance in an appropriate context, i.e. the intended one.

Context selection is governed by the assessment with an optimum relevance. Thus, a speaker may have reason to believe that his

interlocutor will choose the appropriate contextual assumptions and draw the necessary conclusions without an additional aid from the speaker, or may decide to direct the speaker towards the intended interpretation by producing assumptions readily accessible. The connectors are one of linguistic means to achieve this effect. Their function is to guide through the process of interpretation by specifying certain properties of the context and its contextual effects.

The role of connector is to introduce a referential interrelationship constraint, to ensure correct connection of the conceptual information of a sentence. All within the framework of the cognitive relevance theory, Jacques Moeschler brings a more nuanced interpretation of the connectors, but also in respect to this referential interrelationship constraint. He subsequently shows that all the connectors have a hybrid nature, in which the percentage of the procedural and conceptual information contained is variable from one junctive to another (and has a predominantly procedural nature, while, because it refers to the information conceptual framework). Thus, the referential interrelationship constraint is a mental representation. The role a connector has is to operate such representation mental.

The pragmatic connectors, i.e. the circumstantial syntactic jonctives contain some features that help to form the mental representations, in other words, they indicate which type of referential interdependence must be constructed.

Thus, discrimination between coordination and subordination depends on the presence or absence of connectors to explain the relationship between sentences. The category of *SUBNECTORS* is the one that helps clarify the subordination issue because their purpose is to convert the sentences into terms. It is only in the compound sentences that such "indicators of arguments" of the main verb in that main clause, or the matrix sentence (when subordination is multi-levelled). In other words, subnectors introduce the subordinated clauses into the sentence and transform the subordinated sentences into terms of another sentence (matrix).

In Chapter 3, *A Logical Model of Coordination and Subordinated at the Intra-propositional Level*, we have tried to determine intrapropositional operations which are constituted logically between the components of a sentence. From the point of view of propositional operations, an elementary or atomic sentence will be characterised by certain relations between a determined predicate (*a* or *b*) and an individualized term (x_1 şi x_2) which is assigned to this predicate. These ratios will be AX1 And BX1 if true and bx_1 if false.

Since the predicate / verb is the core of the sentence, we have identified various approaches in logic, linguistics and semantics to reach the conclusion that the phenomenon of subordination is directly connected to the understanding of the role of the predicate in a sentence. A predicate and connectors are fundamental elements which are distinguished in the linguistic activity. In the broad sense of the word, both the logical connectors and the predicates are functions, namely the correlations with variables set with the help of a method of values (values of truth in a specific case). Any logical concept is first of all defined, by its material carrier, the linguistic object (a word or a phrase), and secondly by the method of using this object in the linguistic activity of the society.

Therefore, logically, a predicate is a property of the subject that comes along with it, but it shows only the number of arguments without specifying the categorial status and their thematic roles. From a linguistic point of view, argument structure is important for the identification of grammatical categories within the verbal group (*INTERNAL ARGUMENTS*) or outside the verbal group (*EXTERNAL ARGUMENTS*). The predicate and its arguments refer to the verbal group and compulsory nominal groups, the concept of *adjunct / adverbial* shall not be regarded as an argument. The difference between them lies in the fact that a predicate is complemented by its arguments, but adjuncts / adverbials in addition to predicate are optional, which are not required to explain the meaning of the predicate.

From a semantic point of view, the thematic role theory occupies an important place in the identification of relations between a predicate and its arguments. In other words, semantic roles are standard instrumentation for the organization of structure argument in the lexicon, where arguments are identified according to semantic roles (*AGENT, PATIENT, BENEFICIARY, ETC*). The role of an individual thematic verb is defined as a set of properties that a noun has for a certain position of the argument.

The identification of sentence constituents according to the type of the verb (transitive and intrasitive) to establish comple(men)tion justifies the sentence representation. Therefore, an adequate description of the complementation of the nominal group and of the verbal group contains logical rules of structuring of the group and transformation rules.

The means to express a syntactic construction (proposition or part of a proposition) can be of several times unspecific, common with the means to express another construction. In such situations, there is the possibility of a double interpretation of an expression. We tried to explain, thus, some aspects of the phenomenon of homonymy and synonymy of intrapropositional structures. Functional homonymy refers

8

to the availability of one and the same discursive expressions to be multiply labeled, as fundamental logical category, or derived logical category. The grammatical synonymy thing offers lists of clause / sentence rephrasing that are able to express one and the same idea, for example, all the grammatical formulas corresponding to a circumstantial idea. Grammars have highlighted the correspondence principle between secondary clauses and parts of sentences, which reflect the synonymy of syntactic units which differ in form, rather shape than in their meaning.

In sub-section 3.5, the intrapropositional coordination is analyzed in more detail and we have tried to demonstrate by applying the rules of theory X-bar that there might be a conjunctional group in which the conjunction represents the core, and the terms of the group are the *specifier* (the first coordinated term) and its *complement* (the second coordinated part).

In addition to the intrapropositional level, we approached subordination from an attributive perspective, as an integral part of the nominal group (3.5.2.1) and from the point of view related to complement- as an integral part of the verbal group (3.5.2.2.). In other words, the adnominal and the adverbial are additions to the noun or verb. A term is subordinated if its flexionary form is dictated by another term, and the form of the regent form is not influenced by the subordinator's form.

Even if the determinant of the attribute (*noun*, *pronoun*) differ morphologically from the determinant of the complement (*verb, adjective, adverb, interjection*) does not mean that the attribute and the complement are two different types of fundamental parts of sentence. Thus, the concept of a*djunct* (lat. *aiungere* = add) has been promoted to designate a completion both of the name and of the verb. In this paper, we also used in the case of the concept of "*adjunct*" in the case of the adverbial (usually optional) different from the other complements of the verb (subject, objects).

Therefore, we mentioned the role played by these functions in the sentence. At the same time, we have also suggested that they are consistent with roles of the propositions with the same name, taking into account the construction of the sentence into subject and predicate with their adjuncts.

In this way, according to its meaning, the attribute brings additional information on head of the nominal group. It contains different semantic functions in the nominal group: ☞*THE INDIVIDUALIZATION ROLE* - using determiners*: THIS girl, THAT girl, SUCH girl, etc;* ☞ *QUALIFICATION ROLE* (by adjectives, prepositional groups, relative clauses, etc): HANDSOME girl, PARTY song, laughing, etc.; ☞ *QUANTIFICATION*

ROLE (by indefinite determiners, numerals, etc.): *ALL students, FOUR faces*, etc. ☞ *CATEGORIZATION / CLASSIFYING ROLE* (via categorial adjectives, prepositional groups, relative clauses, etc: *EVEN number, CLOTHES brush, the substance WHICH BURNS, etc.;* ☞ *ACTANTIAL ROLES*: *possessor* (by nominal genitive): *the professor's notebook, patient (child abuse)* ☞ *agent* (*storks' leaving*), *experimentator* (*everybody's watch*), etc in relation with a postverbal noun dependent.

Following verbal group cohesion, the complement is part of the verbal group as a compulsory or optional supplement (the adverbial being often considered an adjunct that can be omitted in most cases). This completion is carried out at the semantic, syntactico-referential and lexico-selectional level as a result of restrictions imposed by the verbal head on the complements and the subject, and only in the second place, as a result of constraints exerted by complements on the verbal center (especially from the subject) and by complements one another.

The Romanian Academy Grammar offers an inventory of complements, assigned by the verb, one by one, or grouped two by two or three by three, according to the combinatory capacity and regime of the verb-centre. These are: *SUBJECT, SUBJECT COMPLEMENT, DIRECT OBJECT, SECONDARY OBJECT, INTERNAL OBJECT, INDIRECT OBJECT, PREPOSITIONAL OBJECT, OBJECT COMPLEMENT, POSSESIVE COMPLEMENT, COMPARATIVE COMPLEMENT, AND ADVERBIAL* (as compulsory component requested by some verbs). The adverbial can, however, be considered as an adjunct of the verb, as an addition that provides a nuance to the sentence, even a modalization in some cases, but without it, the sentence still makes sense. The adverbial may be, in its turn, classified morphologically, syntactically, semantically and pragmaticall into: *adjunct itself* (optional adverbial), *subjunct*, *disjunct*, *conjunct*. The syntactic and semantic connections can be seized not only between complements and the center, but also between adverbials themselves, causing obligation of coocurrence of two adverbials, cases of optional coocurence and, on the contrary, cases of incompatibility. These relations shall be determined according to *GENERAL RULES* of compatibility / incompatibility and *PARTICULAR RULES* specific to syntactic and syntactic-semantic classes and sub-classes of verbs.

In *chapter 4, The Logico*-linguistic approach of coordination and subordination at the interpropositional level, we have identified the logical construction of speech and all of its components, clarifying the linguistic constituents according to the relationships with their predicats, becoming functions or arguments for them. The syntactic categories are doubled by the semantic-pragmatic criterion for identifying the interpropositional relations. The problem of acceptability and

grammaticality brings on the same level both linguistics and logic. If a sentence is correct, or incorrect corresponds on the logical level with the truth value of a sentence, being either true or false.

In sub-section 4.1, *Discourse Cohesion and Coherence*, we have referred to two concepts, related to coordination and subordination, which seem identical, but COHERENCE refers to the conceptual connectivity of a discourse, and COHESION performs the sequential connectivity. Coherence defines discourses and is recovered by complying with the rules which regulate the discursive organization of discourse units in a specific language and builds a good discourse, centered around a thematic relation (*thematic coherence*) or on relations between co-referential expressions of a discourse (*referential coherence*). Moreover, a discourse can be perfectly consistent without the existence of any endophoric referential relations. Thus, coherence implies a question of interpretation rather than a formal matter: a series of statements is coherent and represents a well-formed discourse, if and only if, there is an interpretation according to which the statements may be put in connection with one another.

At a certain level, any text is an imitation of tension between a principle of cohesion and one of precision, because any text has, on the one hand, recurring referential items assumed to be known in the context that provides cohesion to the assembly, and, on the other hand, new elements which contribue to an expansion and dynamic informative progression.

The functional perspective of a sentence returns to an old issue about the word order in a sentence, and modern researchers have analyzed both different types of thematic re-runs as well as the role of the theme in the dynamic progression of a sentence.

Cohesion mechanisms are syntactic-semantical by nature, the semantic aspect being highlighted by the textual continuity. The need for clarity, precision and unity of his speech are the qualities referred through recurrence and cohesion. As a result, if the present verbal elements are capable of performing "intratextual connections of meaning"[2] , then there is a cohesion of discourse if there are propositional relations (temporal, thematic, referential relations).

The discourse cohesion sends to the logic of an utterance. Besides the ability of the explicit elements to achieve intratextual connections of meaning, there are also a few elements which contribute to

---

[2] Carmen Vlad, *Textul-aisberg. Teorie şi analiză lingvistico-semiotică*, Editura „Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă", Cluj-Napoca, 2003

the realization of cohesion, such as: *TEXTUAL CONNECTORS, PRO-FORMS, RECURRENCE AND ELLIPSIS.*

An interpropositional relationship refers to a relationship of either explicit or implicit coherence between sentences or groups of sentences which are expressed by sentences or larger portions of text. The interpropositional relations influence the coherence between different parts of the text. According to discourse analysis, a text can be interpreted starting from the way statements are produced one from the other, so that in the end to build a whole, called discourse. *Unity*, *coherence* and *proeminence* are fundamental characteristics of discourse.

Subordination and coordination are presented as instruments of argumentation in the sub-section 4.4.1., from a logical point of view in the form of reasoning and inferences, but also from a a semantic-pragmatic point of view related to the organization of discourse. Argumentation must have a *logical, coherent, dialogic, inferential* and *pertinent* approach. It enables the use of discursive techniques that lead to the production or increase of the mutual agreement to the theses which are presented. The more indirect an argumentation seems, the more successful it is, giving the impression of freedom of choice for the intelocutor.

Modalization is another concept related to the phenomenon of subordination in the sub-section 4.1.2., both by means of the modal logical sentences in different relations to one another and by reporting it to the type of sentence with which combines (universal / particular, affirmative / negative). According to the speaker's involvement in the content of the sentence, we distinguish between the epistemic and deontic modality to which we add the alethic and existential modes. Performative verbs introduce subordinate clauses which form an act ilocutionar which implies *orders* and *commands*, *wishes* and *requests*, *estimates*, *decisions*, *verdicts*, *questions*, etc.

In sub-section 4.3, the interpropositional relations are analyzed from a semantic point of view in order to organize a discourse logically. Therefore, we have identified three fundamental units: *CONCEPT, SENTENCE* and *PARAGRAPH*. These units are arranged hierarchically. Our mind must organize the units in order to understand them and communicate them. As a result, it follows that a certain hierarchical arrangement is required. The fundamental unit of thought is represented by the components that can be an *OBJECT*, an *ACTION*, a *RELATION* or a *GENERALIZATION*. These components are explained by concepts such as morphemes, words and sentences. When these concepts are grouped together they pass from thought to the units of communication. Concepts are grouped into sentences, the smallest units of communication. The

simple sentences in their turn are grouped into complex sentences, then into paragraphs and paragraphs into sections. This process is carried out until, eventually, they form a whole discourse.

Using the concept of *RELATION*, we have identified the connections between sentences (syntactic, semantic and logic) reaching the meanings of connectors which affect the interpretation of a sentence, in a certain context. The *relation* has a general characteristic, due to its structurant role, establishing the connection between the components of a whole. Through its dynamic behavior and its manifestation way, it is *specific*, each existential level having its own connections, which ensure both functionality and specificity.

A speaker selects the lexical units paradigmatically and combines them syntagmatically, based on the logical relations which he/she establishes between sentences, to these logical relations corresponding syntactically to different formal relations. The syntactic relations structure some linguistic unitsby means of which the extralinguistique reality is communicated and received. These units are connected by two ways: *coordination* and *subordination*. It remains, however, to establish in what way these two methods interact in total structure of a sentence.

In sub-section 4.4, we presented the *clause coordination* from a logico-linguistic point of view, considering coordination, as a syntactic relation between units with an equal status, which often have the same shape, but also from a semantic point of view, where the contents of the two sentences should be regarded as relevant to one another. The linking relationship is represented by coordinating conjunctions, such as: *AND, OR, BUT/AND, THEREFORE* etc, as well as by juxtaposition, establishing a series of extensions valid at the level of both coordination and subordination. From a logical-semantic point of view, the syntactic relations may be defined by the linguistic interpretation of logical relations, which is reflected at the level of thought in the extralinguistic connections, *extrinsic* (between objects) and *intrinsic* (within objects), of the types such as *part - assembly*, *content - form*, *substance - quality*, etc.

Between semantics and syntax there is, therefore, a interconditioning relation, the latter is based on syntactic units marked by a meaning, and the former operating with semic units which only update in context, by their use in syntactic combination.

In sub-section 4.5., *clause subordination* is approached from the point of view of equivalence between the parts of a sentence and subordinated clauses, the name of the subordinate clauses corresponding to that of the parts of the sentence substituted (for example: object clause, adverbial, etc). Some linguists even consider that they are part of the

13

sentence in the form of sentence, a structure of transition from group of words to sentence, a sort of "degraded" sentences (similar to the sinsemantic words). The sinsemantic character stems from the fact that, taken as such, isolated, they have no purpose, or have a different meaning than in the context of this sentence. The content of a subordinate clause is therefore, an act of linguistic thinking included in another act.

The relation of inclusion is the closest connection by means of which a sentence operates as a constituent of another sentence. Using the logical subordination pattern, we reach the hypothesis we have to demonstrate that the predicate is the center of the sentence on which all the other constituent parts of a sentence depend.

In sub-section 4.6., we have shown that the discrimation between the sentences coordinated by juxtaposition and the subordinate clauses should exist only by means of the concept of expansion of a sentence by *elaboration*, *extension* and *enhancement*.

As a result, the coordination and subordination phenomena must have a multidimensional approach for the correct interpretation of the relations to be set in a discourse, to argument and validate the speaker's ideas, and the components of a sentence shall be restricted around two large groups: *nominal* and *verbal*, implying that the verb as the centre is increasingly becoming a necessity, and may be considered the engine of the entire sentence. Coordination and subordination are able to justify the necessity to gather the logical and linguistical aspects of language in order to form a coherent discourse and provide the necessary cohesion for an appropriate interpretation.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the coordination and subordination phenomena from a logical-linguistic perspective demonstrates that the two domains can not be neglected for a good understanding of discourse construction at all levels: lexical, morphological, syntactic, logic, semantic and pragmatic. By distinguishing the content and the scope of the fundamental categories, *notions* and *sentences*, we can establish connections and sequencing between them, by applying constructive operations on them. They occur linguistically either by coordination or by subordination, which are deciphered by the logical thinking. Thus, from assumed sentences, we reach the formation of new sentences, in the act of the indirect knowledge of an inference.

The syntactic categories are doubled by the semantic-pragmatic criterion to identify intra- and interpropositional relations. The acceptability and grammaticality of a sentence are logical and linguistic features, at the same time. Correct or incorrect grammar corresponds logically to the truth values of sentences, namely a sentence is either true or false.

Therefore, the contrast between the logic and the language can no longer exist. Rational grammar, supported by the generative – transformational syntax together with the generative semantics suggested a natural logic of the language. Traditional linguistics covers only a classification "word by word" taking into account only the subordination of the parts of a sentence to a dependent. Generative grammar proposes to deduct actual sentences from the propositional patterns allowed by a language system as transformations of a few basic propositional patterns.

However, the syntactic classification is a *sine qua non* condition for the construction of a transformational grammar and the results obtained in this direction represent one of the most obvious merits of the new theory. Some sub-classifications are so detailed, that exceed the limits of grammar. Traditional grammatrs presents lexical constituents as atomic symbols which do not have an internal structure, but in generative grammars, lexical categories are structured entities which are integrated into a pattern or contexts that are specified as grammatical categories. We can identify two such types of grammatical categories: ☞ within the verbal group (*internal arguments*); ☞ outside the verbal group (external arguments) including also the subject in this category.

The distinctions of coordination and subordination related to the arguments of the predicate / verb (become the only main part of sentence) and their corresponding thematic roles offer a new perspective for a logical – linguistic analysis which can be justified from a semantic and pragmatic point of view. The principle of functional correspondence between the parts of a sentence and the subordinate clauses gives us an argument for supporting the predicate as nucleus of a sentence. Because traditionally, the subject is not a subordinated part of a sentence, then there should be no subordinated subject clause. Therefore, in order to support the correspondence between the parts of a sentence and the subordinate sentences, we can deduce that the subject is subordinated to the verb / predicate. The predicative clause does not match entirely the predicate, but only a part of the predicate (the nominal component of the nominal predicate, namely subject complement).

The logical linguistic applications, as well as validity theory, meaning theory and structure theory come to support the point of view according to which the truth of sentences requires the introduction of relations

15

(referential) of the meaning of the sentence phrases and the extralinguistic entities and the existence of expressions saturated with the help of another expression. These lead to the discrimination in   linguistics between ADNOMINAL (that completes a noun) and ADVERBIAL (that completes a verb).

In the context of a syntagmatic analysis, the logical structure composed of subject and predicate implies to distinguish in linguistics a sentence consisting in two important parts and its immediate constituents: NOMINAL GROUP (GN) and VERBAL GROUP (GV). The sentence with its constituents is associated with a categorical judgment, of the type *a is b*, which reduces to the type of noun / name and subject clauses; the predicate / verb includes the subject complement, direct / indirect object, temporal, modal, quantity, consecutive, final adverbials, etc. Therefore, there are no longer subordinated sentences, but only sentences in the form of terms. The terms of ADNOMINAL and ADVERBIAL represent a modern concept of subordination, and the coordination and subordination at the complex sentence level are just relations of some sentences / clauses that are part of a developed sentence.

The method of constituent analysis suggests to examine also the types of relations are contracted between the immediate constituents or with the assembly / whole   ("constitute"). This method does not solve all the problems faced into the traditional grammar, but it manages to give a uniform presentation of the structure of a sentence, by successive decomposing from the highest level up to a morpheme. We always obtain units with the same name (*immediate constituents*), and the relationship between them, on the one hand, and those between them and the whole construction (*the constitute*), on the other hand, are of the same type.

Another (practical) advantage of this method is that it exceeds, or, in any case, avoids the problem of definining units of various levels (*word, parts of the sentence, sentence*) and the relation between morphology and syntax. In addition, by this method, the units are grouped into classes, which are defined according to the contexts in which they may arise. Introducing the distributional point of view has some advantages over the semantic classifications, and, as a result, it discovers types of constructions to which the infinity of possible utterances in a language is reduced. We obtain a more detailed and systematic modelling than the one given in the traditional grammars.

The act of understanding a text unit shall be carried out not only as a result of its perception, but also related to a whole range of other units that do not exist in the text, but in the mind of the one who perceives the text. Labelling a sentence is a syntactic feature of the string of words; it is not given by their meaning, but by their grammatical organization. More precisely, in order that a group of words may form a sentence, it is

16

necessary for it to comply with the combining grammar rules, i.e. to be integrated into a syntactic structure. Within the sentence, all of the words depend, directly or indirectly (i.e. through other words), on the predicate / verb, which is the *core* of a sentence, therefore the idea that even the subject could be regarded as a complement of the verb as predicate.

Generally, any word from a sentence can be replaced with another word, without changing its syntactic function. The substitutes syntactically replaced can not always be semantically substituted; between *syntactic correctness* and *semantic acceptability*, there is no mandatory coincidence. On the syntagmatic axis, the classical concept of *part of the sentence* can be replaced in a satisfactory manner with the *class of functors*, defined as a unit and based on structure. The smallest group of functors is part of a more abstract class, called the syntactic functor paradigm. To each function of a functor there is a corresponding class of functors that can satisfy it. The terms of the microstructure satisfy each other a valency. Valency is defined as a feature of a functor to combine with the members of a class of functors, the combination having a number of formal and content features.

The syntactic content after the analysis of microstructures can be of three types: *functional*, *categorial* and *denotational*. There is an asymmetry between the denotational and functional content: the same functional content corresponds to more denotational content, and vice versa. A major distinction between the functional and the categorical content is the fact that the segmentation in categories sintactice does not match the division into functors, while each functor has its own operational content.

Homonymy and synonymy of intrapropositional structures suppose relations of equivalence, in terms of syntactic structure, as well as from the functional point of view at the level of the logical categories. Due to the relativity and contextuality to labels categories, what matters is the position to which we place the linguistic constituents and dependencies within discourse analysis.

The enumeration of quite different views leads just to one conclusion, that the subject and predicate cover two types of linguistic concepts: ☞ *semantic entities*: "process", "state", respectively "author of the action"; ☞ *grammatical entities*: verb-noun agreement, with a verb whose flexionary form is asked by a noun. The content of syntactic relations is, as a matter of fact, a content of thought. The relation of subordination can be, thus, a logic relation of inclusion, and the relation between the subject-predicate is logic by its very terminology. Coordination was told to associate two terms in a purely logical way, which leaves them independent from a grammatical point of view. It does not create syntactic hierarchies and,

therefore, does not generate grammatical functions. It establishes a simple relation of logical progression.

The name "syntactic semantics" is natural because "semantics" means the study of relations between language and reality. For the neopositivist philosophers, the relations frequently encountered in language, such as "A has the B quality" or "A belongs to the X Class" are, in fact, some patterns imposed by language to reality. The categorial content would be a number of typical organization ways projected by language over the reality, where there are no *attributes* and *classes*, instead all knowledge becomes language. The extralinguistic criterion of the objective reality plays an important role in the analysis of grammar where one attribute shows the origin of the object called by a dependent word, its author, creator or, sometimes its material, its origin, etc.

For many linguists, concepts such as *subordination* and *coordination* are not functional, but categorial: a subordinate word expresses a feature, a quality of the dependent word, and the coordinated terms are at the same level of importance. In the content of a functor would enter one of these three notes: *subordinate*, *coordinated* or *independent,* as very general features.

The semantic opposition between subordination and coordination does not impose by itself and this explains the different views; some operating with three categories, adding the predicative relationship as a special species, others remain at two (subordination and coordination or predication and coordination). The concept of predication generally refers to the fact that the sentence is related to the objective reality.

Both linguistically and logically, any predicator represents a constructive operation by which sentences are generated from notions. The concept of transitivity verbului provides a single argument (a single notion: *noun, pronoun*, etc.), also known as a predicate in a narrow sense (p / n). From two or more notions / concepts as arguments, it will be appropriate to identify relations ($p / nn, p / nnn$). It is therefore justifiable the analysis of a sentence as compound by coordination or as complex by subordination. As a consequence, it appears that the sentences become subordinated terms of a single sentence which depend on a centre, be it nominal or verbal..

The notions of derived logical categories, as operators, or functors, within the categorial grammar, as incomplete expressions are necessary to explain this phenomenon of subordination. They are based on criteria such as: ☞ arguments or addicity of relation - functor; ☞ syntactic category of arguments *and / or*; ☞ syntactic category of the resulted complex resulted by determining (operating on) the arguments. The last criterion implies the existence of creators of fundamental

categories (C-functors) and functors creating other functori (F-functors) with which it is possible to identify the syntactic role corresponding to any part of speech.

This type of grammar implements a linguistic analysis promoted by Frege and which implies that an expression bears significance, and other expressions are assigned meanings depending on the expressions in which they occur. Using the concatenation of an expression to the left / right \ we can make a typology of linguistic objects strating from the fundamental types which represent meaningful expressions.

Due to the current context, which allows to bring together the logic the structure and operation for natural language, favoured by the generative – transformational grammar by delimiting between the deep structure and surface structure, the (predicative) verb installs as a center of reference for the sentence, and its arguments become thematic roles, of participants in actions: agentive, dative, instrumental, resultativ / factitive, objective, locational which correspond to grammatical cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative). These roles have been developed and detailed depending on his features of the verb in a sentence and represents a step forward for the pragmatic analysis which cannot be overlooked.

Because all the predicators are, in fact, relations, coordination and subordination can be interpreted in the light of general features of relationship: univocity - biunivocity - multi-vocity, symmetry – non-symmetry – asymmetry, reflexivity – non-reflexivity - irreflexivity, connectivity – disconnectivity with the help of some laws which establish the logical immediate inferences using connectors. Following the reasoning of thoughts, we can identify general properties of the connectors which expressing subalternation, equivalencies, contradictions, contrarieties, subcontrarietati, conversions and counterpositions between the functions of the truth. The parallelism between connectors and operators representing the immediate inferences are to be found in the simple sentences, demonstrating once again the need for a logical integralism. However, due to the polysemy of conjunctions there will be mismatches between linguistic connectives and their logical translations. The logical language provides the logical rules of use, so that, from a syntactic point of view, the precedent and sequent of a linguistic relationship cover the extent of the truth value as logical form of the sentence, and from a semantic and pragmatic point of view to accept only the antecedent and the sequent which are in an informational continuity of meaning and reference.

The generative - transformational syntax has brought into the spotlight the universal grammar idea, and the generative semantics has

proposed a natural logic. Due to the nominal sentence and verbal sentence as means to interpret sentence, case grammars find their linguistic universals at deeper levels, and by the pragmatic component they suggests a full sentence analysis.

Following the logical structure of a sentence (subject / predicate), the analysis of constituents of a sentence is based on such a demarcation which enables to find the centre / head, but also the parts of a sentence or the traditional subordinate clauses. The latter represents additions / completitions of the nuclei, called *adjuncts,* that is to say, *adnominal* or *adverbial*, which is not compulsory, but bringing particular details to the core which they depend on.

Identifying the attributive subordination and the predicative subordination has been carried out as a result of the transfer of the method from the logical languages to the natural. Without being just truth functions, the linguistic conjunctions can be controlled and disambigued logically, in relation to the number and nature of value combinations defending arguments.

Due to the logical – linguistique categories, the analysis in constituents presents a linguistic dynamics and because one and the same form can have different syntactic values, and one and the same syntactic content is demonstrated by multiple syntactic forms. This categorical grammar places some sentences in the role of terms and has in view the contribution of terms such as the predicators to generating sentences. Therefore, each type of coordination can turn into its alternatives, by expansion, and placing subordinates in the role of terms clarify the false problem of coordination of subordinated clauses with the main clause, as mixed syntactic relation: "he saw, in the distance, a bright startle, *AND WHICH* exploded completely" (Constantin Chirita, Ciresarii). The sentence "exploded completely" is affected by the subnector *which* and it becomes a term, with the same attributive role as the word it is coordinated with "bright". As a result, there is a direct link between the parts of a sentene and subordinated clauses of the same type, due to the transformation of sentences into terms.

Linguistics analyses the constituents of a sentence, using dichotomies, such as: *center vs dependent, nuclei vs satellite, core vs edge node* vs / specifier or additional tool for establishing relations between groups. From the point of view of dependence, these relate to specify, modify and complementthe two important parts of sentence: the *GROUP NOMINAL* and le *GROUP VERBALE*. We need to know how to identify the nuclei, by applying some criteria: ☞ 1. a phrase has *category constancy*, so the status of the phrase is given by the category of the head to which a dependent is connected; ☞ 2. a head *influences the external relations*, giving the

phrase the same type of occurrence as the head; ☞ 3. a head is a *compulsory* constituent; ☞ 4. a head receives *specific valences,* namely it allows specific modifiers, preferred for others; ☞ 5. a head is a *regulator*, namely it determines the morphosyntactic form of its modifier; ☞ 6. a head exhibits *morphosyntactic properties* such as inflections of its dependent constituents in flexionary languages, such as Romanian.

By applying these criteria, we might reach the conclusion that there might be a group that is subject to these rules, which may be dominated by the conjunction *and*, and which might be called the *CONJUNCTIONAL GROUP*. The concept of *prominence* plays an important part in establishing subordination. Hypotaxis, as a characteristic of subordination, implies a hierarchically lower level for a subordinate element.

Both the character of generalisation and specificity of the concept of *relation* allows the identification of relations between sentences (syntactic, semantic and pragmatic) which may be settled, on the one hand, by means of the connection between the components of a whole, on the other hand, by its own relations at the existential level.

The speaker selects lexical units paradigmatically and combines them syntagmatically, based on logical relations which he/she establishes between the sentences, these terms correspond syntactically to formal relations. The syntactic relations structure the linguistic units by means of which extralinguistic reality is communicated and received. These units are linked into the two ways investigated: *coordination* and *subordination*.

The concept of dependence cannot be considered a property, but we can rather speak about a degree of dependence. So, this reflects the degree of integration, as it is perceived or imagined by the speaker. Namely, the more powerfully the semantic or pragmatic connectivity is perceived, the more stronger the connectivity between sentences including the events will be. At the opposite pole on the scale dependence, there are the coordinated and appositional sentences in which a sentence is not made subordinated to another, but it is in an equiordination and inter-dependence relation and based on the function resemblance and the relevant context.

The patterns of the logical – linguistic relations, investigated in this work, shall have in view clause combination criteria into sentences, but taking into account the manner in which they are perceived by the participants to discourse, reporting them at the time of communication and in accordance with their grammatical and logical acceptability. In addition, these relationships provide discourse coherence, by complying with the rules which regulate the discursive organ-nization in a language. The existence of these propositional

relations (temporal, thematic, referential relations) confers cohesion to the discourse sending to the logic of an utterance.

Argumentation is related to the coordination and subordination phenomena by means of reasoning and mediated or immediateinferen, but also by the fact that the sentences in these gears have an organization which can be *logic, coherent, dialogic, inferential and pertinent*. The validity of the reasoning is a logical feature of the interpretation of a discourse, but many theoreticians no longer consider that argumentation should be monopolised, but it can also be the starting point of a rhetorical expansion of the syllogism or by means of the polyphony theory, by a dialogued utterance.

Logic does not take into account a number of verbal, contextual, situational or pragmatic factors which have an effect on the flow of the process of communication and its result: the way in which the assumptions in question are uttered in the usual language, who, and to whom it is addressed, the current context and past, etc. Unfortunately, logiciens approach abstract forms or modes of reasoning in which a conclusion is derived from a variety of premises formalized using various logical constants, without taking into account the normal circumstances in which someone is trying to persuade somebody on a point of view, the aspects pragmatic of reality, so necessary for an appropriate argumentation, without being involved in the discrimination procedure between the valid or invalid forms of an argument.

Subordination is related to the concept of modality, both by the modal system and by factitivity (defined as logical relationship), by supposing the truth of the complement of the sentence. Performative verbs contribue to the modalization of the utterance, accompanying an assertion in a contingent manner to lead to an interpretation correctly decoded. They introduce relations that can be transformed into these illocutionary statements involving order and commands, wishes and requests, estimates, decisions, verdicts, questions, etc.

Coordination and subordination at the interpropositional level should not be considered only some syntactic relations. Furthermore, according to clear arguments, they shall be subjected to a semantic context with a logical organization of ideas, on the basis of common knowledge of a deep structure, which allows deciphering the sent message. The presence or absence of connector of the sentences makes juxtaposition, generally associated with coordination, have the same purpose with the sentences in a subordination relation. Therefore, the interpropositional relations can be developed by *elaboration*, *extension* and enhancements, which demonstrate the patterns of relations, discriminated from a logico – linguistical point of view.

Intra- and interpropositional linguistic analysis is at the same time logic, the thought is trying to compile broader concepts by categorisation and sub-categorisation and find connections necessary for transmitting information in an appropriate context

BIBLIOGRAFIE SELECTIVA

- AJDUKIEWICZ, KAZIMIERZ: *Die syntaktische Konnexitt*, în *Studia Philosophica* (Lvov) 1. 1-27, 1935
- ANSCOMBRE, JEAN-CLAUDE; OSWALD DUCROT: *L'argumentation dans la langue*, în *Langages*, nr. 42, Paris, 1976
- ARSITH, MIRELA: *Semiotica discursului politic,* Editura „Ştefan Lupaşcu", Iaşi, 2005
- ASHER, NICHOLAS; LAURE VIEU: *Subordinating and Coordinating Discourse Relations*, în *Lingua*, pp. 591–610, 2005
- AUSTIN, JOHN LANGSHAW: *How to Do Things with Words,* versiunea în limba franceză *Quand dire, c'est faire,* Editura „Éditions du Seuil", Paris, 1962
- BALLARD, D. LEE; ROBERT J. CONRAD; RONALD. E. LONGACRE, *The Deep and Surface Grammar of Interclausal Relations*, în *Foundations of Language*, nr. 7, pp. 70-118, 1971
- BAR-HILLEL, YEHOSHUA: *On Syntactical Categories*, în *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 15, pp. 1-16, 1950
- BAR-HILLEL, YEHOSHUA: *Language and Information: Selected Essays on their Theory and Application*, Editura „Addison-Wesley", Reading, Massachussetts, 1964
- BERCEANU, BARBU B. : *Sistemul gramatical al limbii române (reconsiderare)*, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, Bucureşti, 1971
- BEEKMAN, JOHN; CALLOW, JOHN; KOPESEC, MICHAEL: *The Semantic Structure of Written Communication,* Editura „Summer Institute of Linguistics Publishing Company", Dallas, Texas, 1981
- BLAKEMORE, DIANE: *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*, Editura „Basil Blackwell", Oxford, 1987
- IDEM: *Denial and Contrast: A Relevance Theoretic Analysis of* But, în *Linguistics and Philosophy*, nr. 12, pp. 15 - 37, 1989
- IDEM: *Indicators and Procedures:* Nevertheless *and* But*, în *Journal of Linguistics,* no. 36, pp. 463-486, 2000
- BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD: *Language*, Editura „Henry Holt", New York, 1933
- BOBOC, ALEXANDRU: *Limbaj şi ontologie*, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, Bucureşti, 1997
- BORKOWSKI, L. (ed.): *Jan Łukasiewicz. Selected works*, Editura „North Holland Publishing Company", Amsterdam / Londra, 1970
- BOTEZATU, PETRE: *Valoarea deducţiei*, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1971
- IDEM: *Semiotică şi negaţie. Introducere critică în logica modernă*, Editura „Junimea", Iaşi, 1973

- IDEM: *Constituirea logicităţii,* Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1983
- IDEM: *Introducere în logică*, vol. II, Editura „Polirom“, 1994
- BRESNAN, JOAN (ED.): *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations,* Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1982
- CÂRÂC, IOAN S.: *Introducere în semantica propoziţiei,* Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1991
- IDEM: *Teoria şi practica semnului*, Editura „Terra Universitas“, Iaşi, 1991
- CARABULEA, ELENA: *Complementul secundar*, în *Gramatica Academiei Limbii Române* (GALR), vol. II, p. 392-396, 2005
- CARNAP, RUDOLF: *Semnificaţie şi necesitate*, Editura „Dacia“, Cluj-Napoca, 1972
- CARSTON, ROBYN: *Thoughts and utterances. The pragmatics of explicit communication*, Editura „Basil Blackwell“, Oxford, 2002
- CAZACU, AUREL M.: *Argumentarea. Teorie şi aplicaţii*, ediţia a doua revăzută şi adăugită, Editura Fundaţiei „România de mâine“, Bucureşti, 2010
- CHAPMAN, SIOBHAM: *Philosophy for Linguists. An Introduction*, Editura „Routledge“, Londra / New York, 2000
- CHOMSKY, NOAM: *Syntactic Structures,* Editura „Mouton“, Haga, 1957
- IDEM: *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax,* Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965
- IDEM: *Lectures on Government and Binding,* Editura „Foris“, Dordrecht, 1981
- IDEM: *Cunoaşterea limbii,* traducere de Alexandra Cornilescu, Ileana Baciu şi Taina Duţescu Coliban, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1996
- IDEM: *The Minimalist Program*, Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1995
- CMECIU, CAMELIA MIHAELA: *Lectures on Concepts of English Syntax*, Editura „EduSoft“, Bacău, 2007
- COMRIE, BERNARD: *Conditionals: A Typology*, în: Elizabeth Closs Traugott (ed.), *On Conditionals,* Editura „Cambridge University Press“, Cambridge, 1986
- COMRIE, BERNARD; PIRKKO SUIHKONEN, VALERY SOLOVYEV (eds.): *Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations: A cross linguistic typology,* Editura „John Benjamins“, Amsterdam, 2012
- CORNILESCU, ALEXANDRA: *Concepts of Modern Grammar. A Generative Grammar Perspective*, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 1995
- COŞERIU, EUGENIU: *Prelegeri şi conferinţe*, în „Anuar de lingvistică şi istorie literară“, tom XXXIII, Editura Institutului „Alexandru Philippide“, Iaşi, 1992
- IDEM: *Omul şi limbajul său. Studii de filosofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistica generală,* Editura Universităţii „Al. I. Cuza“, Iaşi
- IDEM: *Lecţii de lingvistică generală,* Editura „ARC“, Chişinău, 2000
- COWPER, ELISABETH: *A Concise Introduction to Syntactic Theory,* Editura „The University of Chicago Press“, Chicago, 1992

- CREȚU TODERIȚĂ, ECATERINA: *Unităţi, raporturi şi funcţii sintactice în limba română*, Casa Editorială „Demiurg", Iaşi, 2004
- CRISTOFARO, SONIA: *Subordination*, Editura „Oxford University Press", Oxford, 2003
- CULICOVER, PETER W. ; JACKENDOFF, RAY: *Principles and Parameters: An Introduction to Syntactic Theory,* Editura „Oxford University Press", Oxford, 1997
- DANCA, WILHEM: *Logica filosofică. Aristotel şi Toma de Aquino*, Editura „Polirom", Bucureşti, 2002
- DELÉCHELLE, GÉRARD: *Relations inter - énoncés: de la subordination à la coordination*, în *Recherches anglaises et nord-américaine* (RANAM), XXVII, Strasbourg, pp. 29-41
- DE SAUSSURE, FERDINAND: *Curs de lingvistică generală,* Editura „Polirom", Iaşi, 1998
- DIACONESCU, ION: *Sintaxa limbii române.* vol. II*: Relaţiile sintactice,* Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, Facultatea de litere, Bucureşti, 1995
- DIMITRIU, CORNELIU: *Gramatica limbii române explicată,* II: *Sintaxa*, Editura „Institutul European", Iaşi, 1992
- IDEM: *Tratat de gramatică a limbii române,* II: *Sintaxa*, Editura „Institutul European", Iaşi, 2002
- DOWTY, DAVID: *Thematic Proto - Roles and Argument Selection,* în *Language,* vol. 67, nr. 3, pp. 547-619, 1990
- DUCROT, OSWALD: *Les echelles argumentatives,* Editura „Les Éditions du Seuil", Paris, 1980
- DUCROT, OSWALD; SCHAEFFER, JEAN-MARIE: *Noul dicţionar enciclopedic al ştiinţelor limbajului,* Editura „Babel", Bucureşti, 1996
- ECO, UMBERTO: *O teorie a semioticii,* Editura „TREI", Bucureşti, 2008
- ENESCU, GHEORGHE: *Logică şi adevăr,* Editura Politică, Bucureşti, 1967
- IDEM: *Teoria sistemelor logice*, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1976
- IDEM: *Fundamentele logice ale gândirii*, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1980
- IDEM: *Dicţionar de logică*, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1985
- EVANS, DONALD DWIGHT: *The Logic of Self-involvment: A Philosophical Study of Everyday Language with Special Reference to the Christian Use of Language about God as Creator*, Editura „SCM Press", Londra, 1963
- FABRICIUS-HANSEN, CATHERINE; RAMM, WIEBKE (eds.)*: "Subordination" versus "Coordination" in Sentence and Text*, Editura „John Benjamins", Amsterdam, 2008
- FELECAN, DAIANA: *Complementele în limba română actuală. Elemente de sintaxă şi funcţionare discursivă*, Editura „Tritonic", Bucureşti, 2010
- FILLMORE, CHARLES. J. : *Lexical Entries for Verbs*, Editura „D. Reidel", Dordrecht, 1968
- FINEGAN, EDWARD: *Language. Its Structure and Use,* ediţia a doua, Editura „Harcourt Brace", Fort Worth, TX, 1994

- FREGE, GOTLOB: *On Function and Concept* (1891), în *The Frege Reader*, Editura „Michael Beaney", 1997, pp. 130–148
- GRAYLING, ANTHONY CLIFFORD: *Wittgenstein*, Editura „Humanitas", București, trad. din engleză de Gh. Ștefanov a lucrării *Wittgenstein* (1988), Editura „Oxford University Press", 1996
- GRAUR, ALEXANDRU: *Gramatica azi,* Editura Academiei Române, București, 1973
- GREENBAUM, SIDNEY: *Studies in English Adverbial Usage,* Editura „Longman", Londra, 1969
- GRICE, PAUL: *Logic and conversation*, în Peter Cole și Jerry L. Morgan (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, Editura „Academic Press", New York, pp. 41-58, 1975
- GRIZE, JEAN-BLAIZE: *Logique naturelle et communications*, Editura „P. U. F. ", Paris, 1996
- GUȚU ROMALO, VALERIA (coord.) & al. : *Gramatica limbii române,* vol. II: *Enunțul*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1995
- IDEM: *Gramatica limbii române*, I. *Cuvântul*, II. *Enunțul*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005. Tiraj nou, revizuit, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2008.
- HAEGEMAN, LILIANE: *Introduction to Government & Binding Theory*, ediția a doua, Editura „Basil Blackwell", Oxford, 1994
- HALLIDAY, MICHAEL ALEXANDER KIRKWOOD: *Functional Grammar*, Editura „Arnold", Londra / New York, 1994
- HALLIDAY, MICHAEL ALEXANDER KIRKWOOD; HASAN, RUQUAIYA: *Cohesion in English,* Editura „Longman", Londra, 1976
- IDEM: *Antithesis: A Study in Clause Combining and Discourse Structure,* Editura „Information Sciences Institute Publishing House", Marina del Rey, California, 1987
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN*: Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, în *Complex Constructions,* vol. 2, Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 2000
- IDEM: *Coordinating Constructions: an Overview*, în: Martin Haspelmath (ed.) *Coordinating Constructions*, Editura „John Benjamins", Amsterdam, pp. 3 – 39, 2004
- HEGEL, GEORG WILHELM FRIEDRICH: *Enciclopedia Științelor Filosofice. Logica*, Editura „Humanitas", București, 1995
- HJELMSLEV, LOUIS: *La structure morphologique*, în *Essais Linguistiques*, Editura „Minuit", Paris, 1939, pp. 122-147
- IDEM*: Prolégomènes à une théorie du language,* Editura „Minuit", Paris, 1943
- HOLLENBACH, BRUCE: *Discourse Structure, Interpropositional Relations, and Translation*, în *Notes on Translation,* 1962–2002, Editura „Summer Institute of Linguistics Publishing House", Dallas, Texas, 1975
- HORNSTEIN, NORBERT: *Logical Form. From GB to Minimalism*, Editura „Basil Blackwell", Oxford, 1995
- IOAN, PETRU: *Orizonturi logice. Deschideri și resemnificări în universul actual al formalismelor,* Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1995

- IDEM: *Logica „integrală“ în distincţii, operaţionalizări şi exemplificări,* vol. I, Editura Fundaţiei „Ştefan Lupaşcu“, Iaşi, 1999
- IDEM: *Modelul hexadic în politologie,* Editura „Ştefan Lupaşcu“, Iaşi, 2002
- IDEM: *Resemnificări, vol. 1. Logica la confluenţa cu hermeneutica,* Editura „Ştefan Lupaşcu“, Iaşi, 2004
- IRIMIA, DUMITRU: *Gramatica limbii romane. Morfologie, sintaxa,* Editura „Polirom“, Iaşi, 1997
- IVĂNESCU, GHEORGHE: *Gramatica şi logica, II: Structura gândirii ca factor primar al structurii sintactice a limbii*, Analele Universităţii din Timişoara, 1964
- IDEM, *Curs de sintaxa limbii române moderne*, Editura „Junimea“, Iaşi, 2004
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN: „Linguistics and Poetics“, în Thomas Sebeok, (ed.): *Style in Language*, Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“, Cambridge, MA, 1960, pp. 350-377
- JACKENDOFF, RAY S. : *X* [-*bar*] *Syntax: a Study of Phrase Structure*, Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1977
- JESPERSEN, OTTO: *The Philosophy of Grammar*, Editura „University of Chicago Press“, Londra, 1992
- JOHANNESSEN, JANNE BONDI: *Coordination,* Editura „Oxford University Press“, Oxford, 1998
- JORDAN, MICHAEL: *Rhetoric of Everyday English Texts*, Editura „George Allen & Unwin“, Londra, 1984
- KAMP, HANS & REYLE, UWE: *From Discourse to Logic,* Editura „Kluwer“, Dordrecht, 1993
- KAYNE, RICHARD S. : *The Antisymmetry of Syntax,* Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1994
- KEHLER, ANDREW: *Coherence, Reference and the Theory of Grammar*, Editura „Center for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI)“, Stanford, 2002
- KIES, DANIEL: „Indeterminacy in sentence structure“, in *Linguistics and Education: an International Research Journal,* nr. 2, Editura „Ablex Publishing Corporation“, New York, 1990
- KRIPKE, SAUL: *Semantical Considerations on Modal Logic*, în: „Acta Philosophica Fennica“, nr. 16, 1963
- KRISTEVA, JULIA: *Recherches sur une sémanalyse*, Editura „Les Éditions du Seuil“, Paris, 1969
- LANG, EDWALD: *The Semantics of Coordination*, Editura „John Benjamins“, Amsterdam, 1984
- IDEM: *Adversative Connectors on Distinct Levels of Discourse: A Re-examination of Eve Sweetser's Three-level Approach*, in Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Bernd Kortmann (eds.): *Cause - Condition - Concession - Contrast, Cognitive and Discourse Perspective,* Editura „Mouton de Gruyter“, pp. 235-256, 2000
- LAKOFF, GEORGE: *Linguistics and Natural Logic*, în *Synthese*, vol. 22, nr. 1-2 / Decembrie, Editura „Springer“, pp. 151 – 271, 1970
- LEECH, GEOFFREY N. ; MICK SHORT: *Style in Fiction,* Editura „Pearson Education Limited“, Londra, 2007

- LEECH, GEOFFREY N. : *Semantics. The Study of Meaning*, Editura „Pelican“, Londra, 1990
- LEHMANN, CHRISTIAN: *A Survey of General Comparative Grammar*, în *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 24, pp. 175- 187, 1988
- IDEM: *Towards a Typology of Clause Linkage*, în *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, John Haiman and Sandra D. Thompson (ed), Editura „John Benjamins“, Amsterdam, pp. 181-226, 1988
- LEVINSON, STEPHEN C. *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicatures*, Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2000
- LoCASCIO, VICENZO: *Gramatica argumentării. Strategii și structuri,* Editura „Meteora Press“, pp. 126-148, 2002
- LONGACRE, ROBERT E. : *The Grammar of Discourse,* Editura „Plenum“, New York, 1983
- IDEM: *Sentences as Combinations of Clauses*, în Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Complex Constructions,* vol. 2, Editura „Cambridge University Press“, Cambridge, 1985
- MAINGUENEAU, DOMINIQUE: *Pragmatique pour le discours littéraire*, Editura „Bordas“, Paris, 1990
- MANN, WILLIAM C. ; SANDRA A. THOMPSON: *Assertions from Discourse Structure,* Editura „Information Sciences Institute Publishing House“, Marina del Rey, California, 1985
- IDEM: *Rhetorical Structure Theory: A Theory of Text Organization,* Editura „Information Sciences Institute Publishing House“, Marina del Rey, California, 1987
- MANOLIU-MANEA, MARIA: *Structuralismul lingvistic* (*Lecturi critice*)*,* Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1973
- IDEM: *Gramatică, pragmasemantică și discurs,* Editura „Litera“, București, 1993
- MARCUS, SOLOMON: „De la propoziție la text“ în *Semantică și semiotică*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1981
- MARGA, ANDREI; ȘTEFAN MINICĂ; MARIUS MUREȘAN: *Introducere în teoria argumentării și metodologie, vol. I,* Editura „Presa Universitară Clujeană“, Cluj-Napoca, 2004
- MARGA, ANDREI: *Raționalitate, comunicare, argumentare,* Editura „Grinta“, Cluj-Napoca, 2009
- MARTINET, ANDRÉ: *Syntaxe structurale*, Editura „A. Colin“, Paris, 1985
- MARTINICH, ALOYSIUS P. (ed.): *The Philosophy of Language*, Editura „Oxford University Press“, Oxford, 1985
- McCAWLEY, JAMES, *A Program for Logic*, în *Semantics of Natural Language*, D. Davidson & G. Ilarman (ed.), Editura „D. Reidel and Company“, Dordrecht, 1972
- MERLAN, AURELIA: *Sintaxa limbii române*, Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza“, Iași, 2001
- MOISIL C. GRIGORE: *Lecții despre logica raționamentului nuanțat,* Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1975

- NAGY, RODICA: *Sintaxa limbii române actuale-unităţi, raporturi şi funcţii,* Editura „Institutul European“, Iaşi, 2005
- NEŢ, MARIANA: *Lingvistică generală, semiotică, mentalităţi*, Editura „Institutul European“, Iaşi, 2005
- PALMER, FRANK R. : *Mood and Modality*, Editura „Cambridge University Press“, Cambridge, 1986
- PANĂ DINDELEGAN, GABRIELA: *Subcategorizarea verbului funcţie de obiectul direct în gramatica transformaţională a limbii române*, în *Studii şi Cercetări Lingvistice*, XXXI, 1970, nr. 4, pp. 433-453
- IDEM: *Sintaxa transformaţională a grupului verbal în limba română*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 1974
- IDEM: *Teorie şi analiză gramaticală*, Editura „Coresi“, Bucureşti, 1992
- IDEM: *Sintaxa grupului verbal*, ediţia a II-a, Braşov, Editura „Aula“, 1999
- IDEM: *Elemente de analiză gramaticală. Dificultăţi, controverse, noi interpretări*, Editura „Humanitas Educaţional“, Bucureşti, 2003
- IDEM: *Grupul verbal*, în GALR, vol. II, p. 47-72, 2005
- PARTEE, BARBARA; ROOTH, MATS: „Generalized Conjunction and Type Ambiguity“, în R. Bäuerle, C. Schwarze & A. von Stechow (eds.), *Meaning, Use and Interpretation of Language*, Editura „Walter de Gruyter“, Berlin, pp. 361-383, 1983
- PAYNE, THOMAS E.: *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*, Editura „Cambridge University Press“, Cambridge, 1997
- PERELMAN, CHAÏM ŞI OBRECHTS-TYTECA, LAURA: *Traité de l'argumentation*, Editura „L'Institute de Sociologie“, Bruxelles, 1958
- PIAGET, JEAN: *Éssai de logique opératoire,* 1972, (traducere din limba franceză, *Tratat de logică operatorie*), Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, Bucureşti, 1991
- IDEM: *Le structuralisme*, Editura „PUF“, Paris, 1968
- PIERCE, CHARLES S: *Écrits sur le signe*, Editura „Éditions du Seuil“, Paris, 1978
- PÎRVU, ILIE: *Filosofia comunicării*, Editura „Comunicare. ro“, Bucureşti, 2000
- PLETT, HEINRICH F. : *Ştiinţa textului şi analiza de text*, Editura „Univers“, Bucureşti, 1983
- POPA, IOAN LUCIAN: *Modal Verbs and Modality in English*, Editura „Egal“, 2004
- POPESCU, ROXANA-IULIANA: *Logical Connectors in* Dombey and Son *by Ch. Dickens*, în *Cultural Perspectives*, Bacău, nr. 9, pp. 103-116, 2004
- IDEM: *Un model de analiză a textului argumentativ*, Roslir (Revista Semio-logica pe Internet), nr. 1, Editura Universităţii „Ştefan cel Mare“ Suceava, pp. 97-111, 2006
- IDEM: *Tipuri de text din perspectiva logicii discursului-analize*, Roslir (Revista Semio-logica pe Internet), nr. 1, Editura Universităţii „Ştefan cel Mare“, Suceava, pp. 130-140, 2006

- IDEM: *The Fundamental Dimensions of the Linguistic Communication Process*, în Conference Proceedings V, Editura „Land Forces Academy", Sibiu, pp. 210-216, 2006
- IDEM**:** *Communicating Identity through Language*, în *Interstudia,* (*Otherness and Identity, Journeys back to the self*), *vol. 2,* Editura „Alma Mater", Bacău, pp. 84-90, 2008
- IDEM**:** *Towards a Logical Deconstruction of Grammar*, în *Interstudia. Revista Centrului interdisciplinar de studiu al formelor discursive contemporane*, (*Cultural Spaces and Identities in (Inter)actio)n*, nr. 6, Editura „Alma Mater", Bacău, pp. 240-248, 2010
- IDEM: *Thematic Roles and Thematic Hierarchy in English*, în *Interstudia. Revista Centrului interdisciplinar de studiu al formelor discursive contemporane*, nr. 9, Editura „Alma Mater", Bacău, pp. 60-169, 2011
- IDEM: *Logical and Linguistic Cohesion in Ernest Hemingway's „The Old Man and the Sea "*, în *Interstudia. Revista Centrului interdisciplinar de studiu al formelor discursive contemporane,* (*Cultural Spaces. Identity within / beyond borders*), vol. 11, nr. 2, Editura „Alma Mater", Bacău, pp. 237-245, 2012
- IDEM: *Corespondențe logico - lingvistice dintre propozițiile subordonate şi părţile de propoziţie*, lucrare prezentată la Colocviul Internațional „G. Ivănescu - 100 de ani de la naştere", 1-2 noiembrie 2012, Academia Română-Filiala Iaşi, Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide", Universitatea „Al. I. Cuza", Iaşi, Facultatea de Litere, Asociația Culturală A. Philippide, Iaşi
- IDEM: *General Systems Theory Applied to Linguistics,* în Teodor Frunzetti, Marinel-Adi Mustaţă (eds.): *Science in the Mirror: Towards Towards a New Method of Paradigm Comparison,* Editura „Les EDITIONS DU TRICORNE", Geneva, Elvetia, pp. 127-140, 2012
- IDEM: *Linguistic Margins and Nuclei in Discourse,* în *Interstudia. Revista Centrului interdisciplinar de studiu al formelor discursive contemporane* (*Cultural Spaces. Margins, Marginalization and the Discourse of Marginality),* vol. 13, nr. 2, Editura „Alma Mater", Bacău, pp. 154- 162, 2013
- IDEM**:** *Ideas in Interaction: Cohesion and Coherence in Non-native Students. Academic Writing. A Case Study*, în Elena Bonta (ed.): *Perspectives on Interaction,* Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Cambridge, Marea Britanie, pp. 79-90, 2013
- PORTNER, PAUL; PARTEE, BARBARA H. (eds): *Formal Semantics: The Essential Readings,* Editura „Basil Blackwell", Oxford 2002
- PROGOVAC, LIJLJANA: *Determiner Phrase in A Language without Determiners (with apologies to Jim Huang 1982)*, *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 34, pp 165-179, 1998
- QUIRK, RANDOLPH, GREENBAUM, SIDNEY, LEECH, GEOFFREY şi SVARTVIK, JAN: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Editura „Longman", Londra, 1985

- RADFORD, ANDREW: *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English*. *A Minimalist Approach*, Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 1997
- IDEM: *Transformational Grammar: A First Course,* Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 1988
- REBOUL, ANNE; JACQUES MOESCHLER: *Dicţionar enciclopedic de pragmatică,* Editura „Echinox", Cluj-Napoca
- RÉCANATI, FRANÇOIS: *Le dévelopment de la pragmatique*, în *Langue Française*, nr. 42, 1979
- ROVENŢA-FRUMUŞANI, DANIELA: *Argumentarea - modele şi strategii*, Editura „All", Bucureşti, 2000
- RUDOLPH, ELISABETH: *Contrast. Adversative and Concessive Relations and their Expressions in English, German, Spanish, Portuguese on Sentence and Text Level,* Editura „Walter de Gruyter", Berlin - New York, 1996
- RUSSELL, BERTRAND: *Problemele filosofiei*, Editura „All", Bucureşti, 1998
- SĂLĂVĂSTRU, CONSTANTIN: *Teoria şi practica argumentării*, Editura „Polirom", Iaşi, 2003
- SANFORD, DAVID H.: *If P, then Q. Conditionals and the Foundations of Reasoning,* Editura „Routledge", Londra / New York, 1989
- SEARLE, JOHN ROGERS: *Les actes de langage*, Editura „Hermann", Paris, 1972
- SEARLE, JOHN ROGERS; VANDERVEKEN, DANIEL: *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*, Editura „Cambridge University Press", 1985
- SEBEOK, THOMAS A. (ed.): *Writings on the General Theory of Signs by Charles Morris*, Editura „Mouton & co", Haga, 1971
- Idem: *Style in Language*, Editura „Massachusetts Institute of Technology", Cambridge, MA, 1960, pp. 350-377
- SHOPEN, TIMOTHY (ed.)*, Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Complex Constructions*, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985
- SPERBER, DAN & WILSON, DEIRDRE: *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Editura „Oxford University Press", Oxford, 1986
- SPIŢĂ, DOINA PAULA: *Les connecteurs en français et en roumain. Plans d'organisation du discours,* Editura „Institutul European", Iaşi, 2003
- STATI, SORIN: *Teorie şi metodă în sintaxă,* Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 1967
- IDEM: *Interferenţe lingvistice*, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1971
- STEBBING, SUSAN L.: *Logic in Practice,* Editura „Methusen&co. ltd", Londra, 1934
- STIHI, TEODOR: *Introducere în logica simbolică,* Editura „BIC ALL", Bucureşti, 1999
- SURDU, ALEXANDRU: *Actualitatea relaţiei gândire-limbaj. Teoria formelor prejudicative,* Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 1989
- SWEETSER, EVA: *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*, Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 1990

- SCHWENTER, SCOTT A. : *Discourse markers and the PA / SN distinction*, in *Journal of Linguistics,* nr. 38, p. 43-69, 2002
- TAMÁS, GYÖRGY: *The Logic of Categories*, Editura „D Reidel", Dordrecht, 1986
- TARSKI, ALFRED: *The Concept of Truth in Formalized Languages* (1935), în *Logic, Semantics and Metamathematics*, Editura „Oxford University Press", Oxford, 1956, JH Woodger (trad.); „Der Wahrheitsbegriff in Den Formaliserten Sprachen", *Studia Philosophica I*
- IDEM: *Logique, sémantique, métamathematique* (*1923- 1944), Tome premier,* Editura „Librairie Armand Colin", Paris, 1972
- IDEM: *Adevăr şi demonstrabilitate*, în vol. Ilie Pârvu (coord.) *Epistemiologie. Orientări contemporane*, Editura Politică, Bucureşti, 1974
- TEIUŞ, SABINA: *Coordonarea în vorbirea populară românească,* Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1980
- TESNIÈRE, LUCIEN: *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, Editura „Klincksieck", Paris, 1959
- IDEM: *Semantics: an Introduction to the Science of Meaning,* Editura „Basil Blackwell", Oxford, 1962
- THOMSON, RICHMOND H. : *Formal philosophy. Selected papers of Richard Montague,* Editura „Yale University Press", New Haven / Londra, 1974
- TOMESCU, DOMNIŢA: *Analiza gramaticală a textului. Metodă şi dificultăţi,* Editura „ALL EDUCATIONAL", 2003
- TOULMIN, STEPHEN: *The Uses of Arguments*, ediţie revizuită, Editura „Cambridge University Press", 2003
- ŢUŢESCU, MARIANA: *Les grammaires génératives – transformationnelles*, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, Bucureşti, 1982
- ULLMANN, STEPHEN: *Semantics: an Introduction to the Science of Meaning,* Editura „Basil Blackwell", Oxford, 1962
- VANDERVEKEN, DANIEL: *Les actes du discours. Essai de philosophie du langage et de l'esprit sur la signification des énonciations,* Editura „Pierre Mardaga", Bruxelles, 1988
- VAN DIJK, TEUN: *Text and Context,* Editura „Longman", Londra, 1977
- IDEM: *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse,* Editura „Mouton", Haga, 1981
- VAN EEMEREN, FRANS H. ; ROB GROOTENDORST: *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-dialectical Approach*, Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 1992
- IDEM: *Sens, adevăr analitic, cunoaştere*, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1984
- VAN VALIN, ROBERT D; RANDY LAPOLLA: *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function,* Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 1997
- VASILIU, EMANUEL: *Sens, adevăr analitic, cunoaştere*, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1984
- VASILIU, EMANUEL; SANDA GALOPENTIA-ERETESCU: *Sintaxa transformaţională a limbii române,* Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 1969
- IDEM: *Preliminarii logice la semantica frazei,* Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1978

- VASILIU, LAURA: *Some Aspects of the Grammar of the Verb Phrase with Special Reference to Prepositional Constructions*, în *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, vol. XII, nr. 4, p. 341-367, 1967
- VIERIU, SORIN: *Încercări de logică, volumul I,* Editura „Paideia", București, 1997
- VIERIU, SORIN: *Încercări de logică – studii fregeene, volumul II,* Editura „Paideia", București, 2000
- VLAD, CARMEN: *Textul-aisberg. Teorie şi analiză lingvistico-semiotică*, Editura „Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă", Cluj-Napoca, 2003
- VON WRIGHT, GEORG HEINRIK: *Explicaţie şi înţelegere* (trad. de Mihai D. Vasile), Editura „Humanitas", 1995
- ZUGUN, PETRU: *Părţile de propoziţie*, *Cercetări Lingvistice*, vol. XXIII, nr. 1, 1978, pp. 103-110, 1978
- WAGNER, ROBERT-LEON; JACQUELINE PINCHON: *Grammaire du français classique et moderne*, Editura „Hachette", Paris, 1991
- WALD, HENRI: *Realitate şi limbaj,* Editura Academiei Române, București, 1968
- WHITEHEAD, ALFRED NORTH; BERTRAND RUSSELL: *Principia Mathematica* (1913), ediţia a-XI-a, Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 2004
- WILSON, DEIDRE; DAN SPERBER: *Relevance Theory*, în Horn, L. R. & Ward, G. (ed.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics,* Editura „ Basil Blackwell", Oxford, pp. 607-632, 2004
- WINTER, EUGENE O. : *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English*, Editura „George Allen & Unwin", Londra, 1982
- WITTGENSTEIN, LUDWIG: *Investigations philosophiques,* Editura „Gallimard", Paris, 1961
- YNGVE, VICTOR: *From Grammar to Science: New Foundations for General Linguistics*, Editura „John Benjamin", Amsterdam, 1996
- YULE, GEORGE: *Pragmatics*, Editura „Oxford Univeristy Press", Oxford, 1996
- ZAFIU, RODICA: *Conjuncţiile adversative în limba română: tipologie şi niveluri de incidenţă*, în Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (coord.), *Limba română – structură şi funcţionare*, Editura Universităţii Bucureşti, București, 2005, pp. 243-258

Cărţi consultate online: www. questia. com, accesate 09-16. 08. 2012
- ARNOLD, DOUG; MARTIN ATKINSON; JACQUES DURAND; CLAIRE GROVER, AND LOUISA SADLER (eds.): *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*, Editura „Clarendon Press", Oxford, 1989. http: // www. questia. com / read / 54854323
- BÄCK, ALLAN T. : *Aristotle's Theory of Predication*, Editura „Brill", Boston, 2000, http: // www. questia. com / read / 117590640
- BLAKE, BARRY J. : *Relational Grammar*, Editura „Routledge", Londra, 1990, http: // www. questia. com / read / 109218272

- BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD: *Subject and Predicate*, în *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, vol.* 47, pp. 13–22, doi: 10. 2307 / 282823, JSTOR 282823
- BROWN, KEITH, (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 3, Editura „Elsevier", Boston, 2006, http: // www. questia. com / read / 119987788
- COSTERMANS, JEAN; MICHEL FAYOL (eds.): *Processing Interclausal Relationships: Studies in the Production and Comprehension of Text*, Editura „Lawrence Erlbaum Associates", Mahwah, NJ, 1997, http: // www. questia. com / read / 83417662
- EPSTEIN, SAMUEL DAVID; ERICH M. GROAT; RURIKO KAWASHIMA; HISATSUGU KITAHARA: *A Derivational Approach to Syntactic Relations*, Editura „Oxford University Press", New York, 1998, http: // www. questia. com / read / 96195589
- ERNST, THOMAS: *The Syntax of Adjuncts*, Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 2001, http: // www. questia. com / read / 107831176
- EVANS, GARETH: *The Varieties of Reference*. Editura „Clarendon Press", Oxford, 1982, http: // www. questia. com / read / 34257985
- FLAVELL, JOHN H. : *Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget*, Editura „D. Van Nostrand", Princeton, NJ, 1963, http: // www. questia. com / read / 42415796
- GLUCKSBERG, SAM; MATTHEW S. MCGLONE: *Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphors to Idioms,* Editura „Oxford University Press", New York, 2001, http: // www. questia. com / read / 104285428
- GOLDFARB, WARREN: *Deductive Logic*, Editura „Hackett", Indianapolis, 2003, http: // www. questia. com / read / 118010720
- GUTTENPLAN, SAMUEL D. ; MARTIN TAMNY: *Logic, a Comprehensive Introduction*, Editura „Basic Books", New York, 1971, http: // www. questia. com / read / 100974511
- HACKER, PETER M. S. : „6: Naming, Thinking, and Meaning in the *Tractatus*", în Peter M. S. Hacker (ed.), *Wittgenstein: Connections and Controversies*, Editura „Clarendon Press", Oxford, pp. 170-83, 2001 http: // www. questia. com / read / 110002332
- IDEM: *Wittgenstein: Connections and Controversies*, Editura „Clarendon Press", Oxford, 2001, http: // www. questia. com / read / 110002141
- HARLAND, RICHARD: *Beyond Superstructuralism: The Syntagmatic Side of Language*, Editura „Routledge", New York 1993, http: // www. questia. com / read / 107326869
- HECK, RICHARD G. , JR. (ed.): *Language, Thought, and Logic: Essays in Honour of Michael Dummett*, Editura „Oxford University Press", Oxford, 1997, http: // www. questia. com / read / 14364962
- LANGACKER, RONALD W. : *Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*, Editura „Mouton de Gruyter", New York, 2002, http: // www. questia. com / read / 119568364
- LAPPIN, SHALOM; ELABBAS BENMAMOUN (eds.): *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping*. Editura „Oxford University Press", New York, 1999,

http: // www. questia. com / read / 95094813

- MANEA-MANOLIU, MARIA: *Structuralismul lingvistic* (*Lecturi critice),* Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1973
- MCGREGOR, WILLIAM B. : *Semiotic Grammar*, Editura „Clarendon Press", Oxford, 1997, http: // www. questia. com / read / 59001722
- MILLER, JIM; REGINA WEINERT: *Spontaneous Spoken Language: Syntax and Discourse*, Editura „Clarendon Press" Oxford, 1998, http: // www. questia. com / read / 62229114
- MOHANTY, JITENDRA NATH: *Husserl and Frege*, Editura „Indiana University Press", Bloomington, 1982, http: // www. questia. com / read / 98845397
- MURASUGI, KUMIKO; ROBERT STAINTON (eds): *Philosophy and Linguistics*, Editura „Westview Press", Boulder, CO, 1999, http: // www. questia. com / read / 94280932
- O'GRADY, WILLIAM: *Syntactic Development*, Editura „University of Chicago Press", Chicago, 1997, http: // www. questia. com / read / 6449190
- ORASANU, JUDITH (ed.): *Reading Comprehension: From Research to Practice*, Editura „Lawrence Erlbaum Associates", Hillsdale, NJ, 1986, http: // www. questia. com / read / 27728197
- PAIVIO, ALLAN: *Imagery and Verbal Processes*, Editura „Lawrence Erlbaum Associates", Hillsdale, NJ, 1979, http: // www. questia. com / read / 54844495
- TOMASSI, PAUL: *Logic*, Editura „Routledge", Londra, 1999, http: // www. questia. com / read / 105556917
- VALIN, ROBERT D. VAN, JR. : *An Introduction to Syntax*, Editura „Cambridge University Press", Cambridge, 2001, http: // www. questia. com / read / 105048558
- VAN EEMEREN, FRANS H. ; ROB GROOTENDORST; FRANCISCA SNOECK HENKEMANS; J. ANTHONY BLAIR; RALPH H. JOHNSON; ERIK C. W. KRABBE; CHRISTIAN PLANTIN; DOUGLAS N. WALTON; CHARLES A. WILLARD; JOHN A. WOODS; DAVID F. ZAREFSKY: *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory: A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments*, Editura „Lawrence Erlbaum Associates", Mahwah, NJ, 1996, http: // www. questia. com / read / 59117603