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CONCLUSIONS
BIBLIOGRAPHY
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” 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’
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 *bivalence* (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 Gottlob 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 Coșeriu, Gheorghe Ștefănescu 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 approach the phenomena of coordination and subordination of fundamental logical categories (notions / sentences):  

- $\varphi^1$ *SYNTAX OF THE SIGNIFICANT*;  
- $\varphi^2$ *SYNTAX OF MEANINGS*;  
- $\varphi^3$ *SYNTAX OF INTENSIONS*;  
- $\varphi^4$ *SYNTAX OF THE ILLOCUTIONS*;  
- $\varphi^5$ *SYNTAX OF PERLOCUTIONS*;  
- $\varphi^6$ *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
junctives 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 (x₁ and x₂) which is assigned to this predicate. These
ratios will be AX₁ And BX₁ if true and bx₁ 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 intransitive) 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
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 conjunctioinal 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 adjunct (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 combinatorial capacity and regime of the verb-centre. These are: SUBJECT, SUBJECT COMPLEMENT, DIRECT OBJECT, SECONDARY OBJECT, INTERNAL OBJECT, INDIRECT OBJECT, PREPOSITIONAL OBJECT, OBJECT COMPLEMENT, POSSESSIVE 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 pragmatically 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 cooccurrence of two adverbials, cases of optional cooccurrence 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 predicates, 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 contribute 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-semantic 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 “inratextual 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

the realization of cohesion, such as: TEXTUAL CONNECTORS, PRO-FORMS, RECURRENT 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 prominence 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 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 intelloctor.

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 illocutionary 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 units by 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 extralinguistique 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
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 discrimination 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 grammars 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: \( \propto \) within the verbal group (*internal arguments*); \( \propto \) 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
(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 \( a \text{ is } b \), 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 defining 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
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 syntactice 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 categorical 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 funtori (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 delimitating 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, contradicitions, subcontrarieties, 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 suggest 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 / completions 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 disambiguated 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 sentence 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 complement the 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 *CONJUNCTURAL 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-ization 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 immediate infereren, 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, logicians 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 contribute 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.
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