Universitatea Transilvania din Brașov

INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL SCHOOL

Faculty of Letters

Timea PROSAN

Correlative Constructions in Contemporary Romanian

SUMMARY

Scientific supervisor

Prof. Dr. Mihaela GHEORGHE

BRAȘOV, 2024

INTRODUCTION

Correlatives are rare constructions in natural languages. They appear/appeared mainly in Sanskrit, Latin, Greek and Indo-Aryan languages (Lipták 2009), but research from the last decades demonstrates that these constructions are also observable in Indo-European languages (Quirk et al. 1972, Downing 1973, De Vries 2002, Citko 2009, Arsenijevic 2009, among others).

The object of this research is the correlative constructions (CC) in the contemporary Romanian language (LRC), whose specific feature is the ratio of mutual and symmetrical implication between the constituents. More precisely, the way in which this relationship is achieved at the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic level is analyzed, thus presenting the distinctive features of CC at the LRC level, which have either a coordinated structure through repetitive conjunctions, or a subordinate relative, pronominal or conjunctional structure.

The complexity of these constructions and the importance of studying them from a synchronic point of view will be proven, thus, through the proposed monographic study.

Moreover, correlative constructions represent a niche of grammar, at the level of which in-depth research has not yet been carried out. These structures are too little targeted/treated in the specialized works in the Romanian bibliography, the research so far having, rather, a preliminary character. This lack therefore motivates the need for research on correlative structures in the context where the subject has been treated with regard to other languages (German, Hungarian, Norwegian, Korean, English, Turkish, etc.): Lipták (2009), Fery (2016), Meinunger (2016), Schwabe (2016), Chung (2004), Johannessen (2005), Hendriks (2004), Hofmeister (2008), Hoffmann (2019), Demirok (2017), among others. The position adopted in this paper therefore has a complementary character, the intention being to combine the tools of generative grammar with the studies carried out on the subject of CC.

The contribution of the mentioned authors is, above all, the attempt to frame correlatives in structural and semantic typologies, to highlight the semantic-syntactic mechanism underlying the generated statement and to explain the effects created by the use of correlatives at the pragmatic level, depending on the purpose communication. Using the models proposed in the international bibliography, it is resorted to the adaptation to the linguistic material extracted from contemporary Romanian language texts. Thus, a detailed analysis of the correlative constructions in LRC is proposed, based on a rich corpus of texts and using concepts specific to modern grammar.

A relevant aspect, highlighted through the work, is the fact that the correlative pattern of the Romanian language is varied, with numerous formal, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic peculiarities.

The premise is that these constructions have a bipartite structure, and between its constituents (between the correlative and the head of the relative or other connectors/between the repetitive conjunctions) a relationship of semantic and structural symmetry is achieved (Bittner 2001, Den Dikken 2005, Lipták 2009, Mignon 2009, Hoffmann 2019). Starting from this premise, the aim is to describe a whole series of features of CC. For example, at the formal level, the homogeneity/heterogeneity of the constituents is illustrated, respectively their obligation within the CC. At the semantic level, a typology of CC is made, these being classified into oppositional, temporal, causal constructions, etc. From a syntactic point of view, the syntactic ratio at which the correlation is made (coordination vs. subordination) is highlighted, respectively the relevance of the position of preposition/postposition to the regent. Regarding the pragmatic aspects, the emphatic role that correlatives can have is highlighted and the status of Topic and Focus, the process of focusing, topicalization, grammaticalization and pragmaticization is analyzed.

With the help of a nuanced theoretical apparatus and through a rich inventory of examples from both the written and the spoken language, the universal aspects of these constructions are verified and also specific aspects of CC in the Romanian language are highlighted, respectively the trends in their current use.

The most important aspects captured in the description of correlative constructions in LRC are the following: semantic, structural and discursive-pragmatic features, syntactic organization, the frequency of these constructions in the corpus of LRC, their variety, trends in their current use, respectively the rich inventory of used connectors. The questions to be answered are:

(i)   Are all CC semantically and syntactically symmetric structures?

(ii)   To what extent and in what sense does CC modify the complex statement?

(iii)   What are the main classification criteria of CC?

(iv)   Are correlatives just emphatic elements?

(v)   Are there any trends in the use of CC in current language (spoken and written)?

The specific objectives in mind are:

(i)   Selection and classification of all CCs from the compiled corpus;

(ii)   Highlighting common/particular aspects of CC in written and spoken language;

(iii)   Realization of a typology of CC in LRC;

(iv)   CC analysis from a semantic, syntactic and pragmatic point of view;

(v)   Relief of some pragmatic issues by administering a questionnaire to native speakers of the Romanian language.

So, these are the aspects through which they contribute to the complex study of CC in LRC, presenting an extended perspective on correlatives.

The main objective of the present paper is to create a description of CC in LRC, starting from a rich corpus, which includes both written and spoken Romanian language samples.

In the description of CC, I started, of course, both from the earlier and more recent descriptions, such as the works of Rizescu (1962), Constantinescu-Dobridor (1972), Bejan (1979), Neamțu (1982), Bîtea (1987), Stan (1989), Diaconescu (1989, 1995), Brașoveanu (2008), Chircu (2008), Bîlbîie (2008, 2024), Croitor (2013, 2016) and Gheorghe (2004, 2018).

The results of this analysis are highlighted through the prism of an integrative theoretical model (targeting the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic levels) and reveal a perspective to typologically frame the correlative constructions[1]. From a methodological point of view, therefore, the descriptive-interpretive perspective is approached, not just a quantitative one. Beyond the descriptive perspective, we also had in mind a comparative perspective between the spoken language and the written language, respectively between the Romanian language and other languages (Romance languages, English, German and Hungarian).

The bibliography consulted is in particular that related to correlatives: Bittner 2001, Zitterbart 2002, Borsley 2004, Hendriks 2004, Mouret 2004, Citko 2009, Den Dikken 2009, Lipták 2009, Progovac 2009, Davison 2009, Mignon 2009, Zhang 2010, Sachs 2016 , Hoffmann 2019, Belyaev & Haug 2020, among others.

In the semantic field, most works particularly focus on comparative correlatives, which express the idea of successive cyclicity and are based on a conditional value (McCawley 1988, Cullicover & Jackendoff 1999, Borsley 2004, Den Dikken 2005, Meinunger 2018, Hoffmann 2019) . At the same time, Arsenijevic (2009) insists on the relative structure of conditional CC, and Leung (2009) establishes semantic criteria for matching the two constituents (eng. matching). Zitterbart (2002) semantically classifies German CCs into conditional, causal, consecutive, modal and proportional.

From a syntactic point of view, the focus falls on the position of the two constituents of CC (Downing 1973, Srivastav 1991, Den Dikken 2005), on syntactic symmetry (Zhang 2010, Sachs 2016), on the difference between interrogative relative, free and correlative relative (Citko 2009) and on issues related to the left periphery (Demirok 2017, Meinunger 2018).

From a pragmatic perspective, Kántor (2008) highlights the Focus status of correlatives and the property of generating contrastive sentences.

In the specialized bibliography, synchronic studies about CC predominate. For example, Hoffmann (2019) proposes the Dynamic Model, through which he analyzes CCs that do not allow the inversion of constituents. Rebuschi (2009) presents the CC features in the Basque

---

[1] The importance of this integrative theoretical model encompassing all three linguistic domains is highlighted by Langacker (1987, 1991), Sportiche (1996), Hannay & Machtelt (1998), Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet (2000), Jaszczolt (2005), among others.

language, explaining their role in the development of the Northern Basque language. Davison (2009) describes the situational value of CC in Sanskrit and Hindi, analyzing them contrastively. Zitterbart (2002) carries out a classification of CC from a semantic point of view, highlighting the correlative associations made through adverbial expressions.

Among the few diachronic studies are the work by Cable (2009), which describes the syntactic evolution of correlatives in Tibetan, and the monograph by Hoffmann (2009), which takes not only a synchronic but also a diachronic perspective on correlatives in English.

In the present paper, linguistic phenomena related to CC are addressed in the contemporary period of the Romanian language, thus being a synchronic research, where possible, some diachronic observations are also made.

The corpus of LRC that is the basis of the work is created by the author and is organized into two microcorpora: LRC1 (written language) and LRC2 (spoken language).

The corpus of the written Romanian language is formed with the help of the Sketch Engine and CoRoLa programs and includes examples from the literary, scientific, publishing, administrative register. Each example provided in the paper has its source specified (the site from which it was taken).

The corpus of the spoken Romanian language is made up of texts that focus on verbal interaction, extracted from the following volumes:

- LV01 – Hoarță Cărăușu, Luminița, 2013: Corpus of current non-dialectal spoken language, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Publishing House, Iași.
- LV02 – Pop, Liana, Corpus in Romanian – forums.
- LV03 – Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana, 2002: Verbal interaction in the current Romanian language. Selective corpus. Typology sketch, Bucharest University Publishing House.
- LV04 – Dascălu Jinga, Laurenția, 2002: Corpus of spoken Romanian, Oscar Print Publishing House, Bucharest.
- LV05 – Reference corpus for current Romanian: CoRoLa (http://racai.ro)[2].

LV01 contains religious, didactic, advertising, media and spontaneous speech. LV02 is made up of comments posted on various forums. LV03 contains different forms of verbal interaction: free and controlled direct interaction, free and controlled mediated interaction, monologic interaction. LV04 is based on approximately 65 hours recorded by the authors in the period 1993-2001. Also, LV05 includes different recorded contexts that can be listened to depending on the search phrase.

---

[2]Both written texts and sequences of verbal interactions can be found within CoRoLa.

In a total number of 320 sites, respectively in the spoken language corpora mentioned above, we identified all the contexts in which CC appear, thus obtaining a total number of 6000 correlative constructions. In order to obtain relevant results, we opted for the distribution of an equal number of 3000 constructions within each microcorpus.

I ordered the selected constructions in Word and Excel programs, in order to obtain a "database" of the CC, useful in making statistics and diagrams for the semantic, formal, syntactic and pragmatic analysis of the constructions. Also, using the Sketch Engine program, we created an internal "database" with the help of the filters and tools provided by the program, which allowed returning to the identified examples whenever necessary (see Appendix 2).

I have included the most important quantitative data in chapter 4, subsection 4.2. Corpus analysis – Quantitative data, where we highlighted by a diagram the distribution of CC in coordinating and subordinating correlatives and the distribution of CC in different stylistic registers.

Table 1 of chapter 4, subsection 4.2. presents an inventory of the linguistic material provided by the corpus. In this table, I have entered all 122 correlative patterns identified in LRC1 and LRC2, mentioning the kind of syntactic relationship at which they appear (coordination/subordination), the type of construction (copulative/disjunctive/opposite, etc.), the occurrences in LRC1, the occurrences in LRC2 and total occurrences in LRC.

Other quantitative data also appear in subchapter 5.3., 6.3., respectively 8.3., with the role of illustrating the occurrence of CC at the level of coordination/subordination and within the preferences of native Romanian speakers.

In subchapter 5.3., we highlighted the distribution of coordinating correlatives according to the homogeneity/heterogeneity of the constituents in both LRC1 and LRC2. In Tables 5 and 6 we have reviewed all the coordinating correlative patterns, noting the type of construction they are part of.

In subchapter 6.3., I included quantitative observations regarding the subordination ratio and illustrated by diagrams the distribution of CC in non-circumstantial, relative circumstantial and conjunctive circumstantial.

In sub-chapter 8.3., we quantitatively analyzed the answers given by the participants to the questionnaire in Annex 1 and made different diagrams to illustrate the current trends in the use of CC.

For the identification of CCs from LRC2, we chose the classic, manual analysis of the corpus to avoid ambiguous constructions, which are not actually CCs.To avoid this ambiguity, the exact understanding of the grammatical and semantic relations between the constituents of the correlation is necessary.

For the texts within the Sketch Engine and CoRoLa programs (related to the micro-corpus LRC1), we opted for the automatic CC analysis, generated by the search engine of these two programs. Sketch Engine's features and search engine made it easy to search for CC, especially through Word Sketch commands and Concordance, both commands being useful for identifying both CC constituents.

At the same time, setting the filters (keep lines containing/not containing..., hide sub-hits, collocations) contributed to a fast, efficient and secure CC search. The keep lines containing/not containing filter helped to identify the contexts in which both terms of the correlation appear, the hide sub-hits filter removed identical contexts in which CCs appear, and the collocations filter strictly identified the situations in which both constituents appear you have CC, along with a possible restrictive operator.

Regarding the search program within CoRoLa (Reference Corpus for the Contemporary Romanian Language), we used the advanced search which allows searching by the current form, by the lemma and/or the morphosyntactic description (MSD). Pressing the + sign generated as many fields as needed for the advanced CC search, making it possible to identify both constituents within the CC, just like Sketch Engine searches.

Also, the 24 statistics and diagrams made on the basis of this rich linguistic material complete the descriptive/qualitative interpretations, having a complementary character within the analysis and revealing the main tendencies of Romanian speakers regarding the use of CC.

In order to obtain relevant and illustrative statistics for the LRC, we resorted to the creation of a corpus as rich as possible (with 6000 CCs in total) and to a stratified and systematized sample. The two main samples are: one based on the distinction between written language and spoken language and another based on the registers to which the written texts belong (fictional, scientific, journalistic, administrative).

In order to organize the analysis part of the paper, we approached the following criteria in the creation of statistics, because they correspond to the objectives already indicated:

(i)   The syntactic ratio at which CC appear - coordination vs. subordination;

(ii) The syntactic position in relation to the regent – preposition vs. postponement;

(iii) The formal aspect – homogeneity vs. heterogeneity;

(iv) Type of subordinate – circumstantial vs. non-circumstantial;

(v)   Connector type – relative/conjunctive/pronominal;

(vi) The pragmatic aspect – Focus vs. Topical.

In appendices 2 and 3 we have included one sequence from the CC sample from LRC1 and LRC2, respectively.

Since CC is being followed in the current state of the Romanian language, I decided that it is extremely useful, in addition to the careful and detailed analysis of the examples from the

corpus, to administer a questionnaire related to CC to native speakers of the Romanian language. This questionnaire (see Appendix 1), consisting of eight questions, includes the most frequently used CC (those that have a high occurrence in LRC1 and LRC2) and expresses their function within the transmission of a message (clarification of logical relationships, structuring the phrase, connecting ideas, highlighting some aspects).

The eight questions addressed to the 100 participants were formulated starting from the following aspects/trends often found in the current use of the Romanian language:

(i) highlighting/focusing on a certain part of the message sent via CC;

(ii) the tendency to preposition/postposition of the correlative and the meaning of a certain positioning;

(iii) the need to introduce a restrictive operator within the CC;

(iv) removing CC in order to simplify the message.

We note that between point (i) and (iv) there is no contradiction, but it is about certain contexts in which, as we will see in the analysis of the questionnaire in subchapter 8.3. CCs used by native Romanian speakers – a pragmatic perspective, speakers are inclined to introduce or, on the contrary, remove CCs. Also in this sub-chapter I have synthesized, based on each answer, the specific tendency of each context in which CC appear.

The paper is organized in two large parts (with a total number of eight chapters), structured as follows: in the first part of the paper the aim is to present the theoretical benchmarks that will be used in the CC analysis, and in the second part we present the corpus analysis at the formal, semantic, syntactic and discursive-pragmatic level.

In the first part, concepts and theories relevant to the study of CC are presented, respectively their main particularities and functions within the complex statement. First, I defined concepts such as complex statement, syntactic relation, connector, etc., then moving on to classification criteria and distinctive features of CC. We also carried out a review of the international and Romanian bibliography regarding CC, highlighting the main directions of interpretation.

The second part includes the actual analysis of the corpus, through which the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of CC are highlighted, respectively the deviations from the literary norm and the semantic/categorical incongruities that produce asymmetrical CC.

Both parts contain an introductory paragraph (preliminary remarks) and a final paragraph, which summarizes the most important remarks from the respective chapters.

In the first chapter I described the concept of complex statement – an important concept in research because correlation itself involves a type of complex statement. We highlighted the peculiarities of the organization of the complex statement, with emphasis on the two types of syntactic relationship: coordination and subordination.

The second chapter deals with the connectors of the complex statement from a morphological, syntactic and semantic perspective. An important distinction we made, at the syntactic level, is between complementizers and circumstantial conjunctions, respectively between coordinating and subordinating connectors. At the morphological level, I mentioned the polyfunctional status of some relationship elements (for example after, which can be a preposition, subordinator or adverb of time). At the semantic level, we reviewed the prototypical semantic values that connectors can have (causal, temporal, adjunctive, etc.). Also, also in this chapter, I introduced correlatives among connectors (in addition to complementizers, subordinators and relatives), classifying them according to the syntactic relationship to which they contribute and mentioning the role of the restrictive operator within CC.

Chapter 3 is a review of the international and domestic bibliography, supplemented by the history of the concept of correlative and the main features/functions of CC and the phenomenon of correlation (complex structure, lexicalization of the antecedent trace, anaphoric character, double correlation and focus function) . Within the international bibliography, we presented theoretical benchmarks from the Anglophone space (McCawley 1988, Den Dikken 2005, Hoffmann 2019, among others), Hungarian (Kiss 2002, Kántor 2008, Lipták 2008, 2009, Bácskai-Atkári & Dékány 2014, 2015), German (Bittner 2001, Zitterbart 2002, Axel-Tober 2002, Sachs 2016, Meinunger 2018, etc.) and from the Romance linguistic space (Mouret 2004, Abeillé et al 2006, Bîlbîie 2008, Mignon 2009, Sanchez Lopez 2017). Regarding the Romanian bibliography, I mentioned his studiesStan (1989), Brașoveanu (2008), Chircu (2008), Bîlbîie (2008), Croitor (2013, 2016) and Gheorghe (2004, 2018), among others,which represented solid starting points of the present research.

Chapter 4 includes preliminary observations regarding the criteria for classifying CC from a formal, semantic and syntactic point of view (classification into symmetrical and asymmetrical constructions, homogeneous and heterogeneous constructions, disjunctive, oppositional, alternative constructions, etc.) and relevant quantitative data within the corpus analysis regarding the distribution of coordinating and subordinating correlatives, respectively the distribution by stylistic registers.

Chapter 5 focuses on the coordination report, and chapter 6, the subordination report. I have covered CC, in both chapters, starting from the bibliography presented above and providing examples from both written and spoken language. I supported the analytical and descriptive aspects through quantitative data, thus combining the two types of analysis. CC classifications and interpretations are original, since, at the moment, there is still no unified classification of CC structures.

In chapter 7 I exemplified semantic and categorical incongruities among "asymmetrical" constructions, quite common in LRC. I have recorded numerous situations in which, for

example, relative adverbs become temporal adverbs (How did he come, how did he get to work). Starting from such examples, we interpreted and exemplified the concepts of desemanticization and resemanticization (Brașoveanu 2008b).

In chapter 8 I analyzed CC at a pragmatic level, through concepts such as Focus and Topic, emphasis mark/emphasis, focus, grammaticalization, pragmaticalization. The administration of the questionnaire in Annex 1, through which we evaluated the extent to which native speakers resort to CC, respectively the purpose of their use, allowed the completion of the analysis with the pragmatic perspective.

Part I. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL DELIMITATIONS

The first part of the paper is devoted to the presentation of the theoretical framework used in the analysis of structures with correlative in LRC. This presentation includes detailing the concepts and phenomena specific to modern grammar relevant to CC research (complex statement, predicative verbal center, adjunct, left periphery, correlation/correlation, etc.). At the same time, the bibliography of the topic (both domestic and international) is reviewed, thus establishing the current state of research on CC and highlighting their relevant features/functions.

Chapter 1 – Theoretical and methodological framework

The purpose of this chapter is to present the theoretical concepts related to the complex statement, since the statements containing CC are themselves complex statements.

Briefly, CC utterances consist of two semantically and categorically symmetric/congruent constituents. The following utterances contain the CC either... or, not only... but also, therefore... in order to, which express, in turn, disjunctive, cumulative, and goal semantic values:

1. *Whetherchildren have taken over the reins of the planet, or the need for fantasy has increased in direct proportion to the economic crisis.*(http://www.diversbucuresti.ro/)

2. *I discovered not only flower names, but also legends related to some of them.*(https://amfostacolo.ro/)

Becausethey turn you outward so that you depend on them and give them energy.(http://www.spiritus.ro/)

Chapter 2 – Complex Statement Connectors

The connector, the linguistic element responsible for the integration of subordinate elements within the utterance, is "the one that must submit to the constraints of the center" (Gheorghe 2009: 42). For the present work, both the connectors that ensure the connection at the propositional level (1) and the connectors at the phrasal level (2) are relevant, because in the corpus we have identified CCs corresponding to both levels:

(1) Neither distance nor time calculation shall drive the payment display device. (http://www.conta.ro/)

(2) Neither bite nor sting. (http://www.aztekium.ro/)

In this chapter, the features of the connectors are presented, and in the next chapter the explicit transition to CCs containing connectors of the type presented in the two examples above will be made.

Chapter 3 - Correlative constructions in the specialized bibliography - the current state of the research

Before the actual analysis of the enunciative contexts in which correlatives appear, a review of the definitions attributed to the term correlative, appearing in various dictionaries and linguistic works, is proposed, highlighting their main directions of interpretation.

The study of correlatives at the level of the Romanian language is a fragmentary one, without a unitary and complex perspective on CC, but which traces the main directions of interpretation and facilitates research in this field. That is why the present work represents an attempt to present the constructions with correlative from the LRC from a point of view that differs, to an appreciable extent, from the perspective approached in the specialized works so far, especially by the fact that it has see the multiple realizations of correlatives (both coordinating and subordinating ones) at the formal, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic level.

CC represents some complex syntactic phenomena in the different languages of the world (English, German, Hungarian, Korean, Turkish, Norwegian, Dutch, Romance languages, etc.) and, most of the time, a set of common features can be highlighted. In principle, the basic features of CC are (Downing 1973, Srivastav 1991, Lipták 2008, Mignon 2009, Zhang 2010, Sachs 2016, Links et al 2017):

(i) the peripheral position of the relative clause;

(ii) the possibility of embedding the nominal group in both the relative and the correlative clause;

(iii) the demonstrative requirement regarding the correlative;

(iv) the availability of several relative clauses.

Among the main features of CC are:

- lexicalization of the antecedent trace;
- complex structure;
- the anaphoric character – the function of resumption;
- focus function.

In the CC classification, we took into account the following criteria related to the proposed integrative theoretical model:

(i) **The semantic criterion**– from the semantic point of view, CC expresses values of temporality (when... when), modality (so... how), causality (therefore... because) etc. and thus I classified them into temporal, modal, causal, etc. CCs. At the same time, we highlighted the semantic incongruities within the CC, analyzed in chapter 7, without a high frequency, but important to achieve a complete systematization from the semantic point of view.

(ii) **The syntactic criterion**– we classified the CC according to the syntactic ratio of coordination and subordination, thus structuring them in two parts – chapter 5, respectively chapter 6;

(iii) **The formal criterion**- based on this criterion, we made the distinction between homogeneous constructions (with the two identical constituents) and heterogeneous constructions (with the two different constituents), respectively between isolated constructions (with the subordinate isolated from the correlative, being in preposition or postposition) and non-isolated constructions (with the correlative in the immediate vicinity of the connector);

(iv) **The structural criterion**– from a structural point of view, correlatives are obligatory (the presence of both constituents is obligatory – for example, not only..., but also; either..., either, etc.) or optional (the structure can be non-correlative – for example, or ... or, then... when etc.);

(v) **The pragmatic criterion**- at the pragmatic level, we highlighted the anticipatory and repeating correlatives (integrating in the analysis the concepts of anaphora and cataphora), respectively the correlatives with the role of focus and topic.

In making the inventory of CC we started from the narrower classifications of Bîlbîie 2008, Chircu 2008 and Iliescu 2008 which include coordinating, temporal and some subordinate correlatives. The own contribution consists in adding several patterns of CC present in a certain type of utterance, respectively in identifying the CC at the level of the additional predicative, the predicative complement of the object and the secondary complement.

Part II. CORRELATIVE STRUCTURES IN THE CONTEMPORARY ROMANIAN LANGUAGE - CORPUS ANALYSIS

Chapter 4 – Classification of correlatives from a formal, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic point of view

CC are generally "symmetrical" constructions, in which the terms of the correlation are congruent under the categorical and semantic aspects, although there are also constructions "in which either syntactic asymmetries or semantic shifts are manifested" (Gheorghe 2018: 167). We will treat the "asymmetric" constructions especially under the aspect of de-semanticization, a process that involves the loss of the primary meaning of the correlatives. This distinction between "symmetrical" and "asymmetrical" constructions is not relevant from a theoretical point of view (Gheorghe 2018: 167), but we want to mention it, because in descriptive terms we will thus note the variety of patterns identified in the selected corpus.

Semantic, syntactic and structural variety is illustrated through examples taken from the corpus. For a clear, concise and comprehensive view, I have structured the interpretative process in several sub-chapters, starting first of all from the syntactic phenomenon of coordination and subordination. Thus, the analysis includes two large parts: the first part – the interpretation of the CC that appear at the level of the coordination report, respectively the second part – the interpretation of the CC that participates in the formation of the subordination relationship.

At the level of the coordination relationship, we will describe the correlation achieved by means of the conjunction and adverbial system, with homogeneous elements (or... or, ba... ba, nor... nor, etc.) and with heterogeneous elements (not... but, not only... but also, not only... but also, both... and etc.). We will also highlight the semantic relationship achieved between the coordinated sentences, as well as the obligation of the terms in correlation (for example, the doubling of the disjunctive conjunction either is mandatory, while or/or may also appear as non-correlative elements). At the same time, we will analyze the belonging to a certain morphological class of some structures that have given rise to contradictory interpretations at the level of specialized literature (the inclusion of coordinating correlative structures in the conjunctional vs. adverbial pattern).

At the level of the subordination relationship, we will emphasize the position of heterogeneous constituents, describing the correlative patterns in constructions with relative propositional adjuncts, introduced by the conjunctions where, when and how, etc. and in structures with conjunctive propositional adjuncts, introduced by the circumstantial conjunctions although, because, in order to, etc. We will also analyze pronominal correlation within non-

circumstantials. In this endeavor, we will differentially describe the positions of correlative versus subordinate and interpret (i) non-isolated correlative constructions, (ii) double-correlative constructions, and (iii) isolated correlative constructions. From a semantic point of view, we will exemplify and describe the temporal, modal, local, concessive, final, causal, consecutive, conditional correlatives, also presenting the situations in which semantic incongruities are manifested, called by Brașoveanu (2008: 132) "de-semanticizations". From a pragmatic point of view, we will approach the concepts of Focus and Topic, considering the entire communication situation in which CCs appear. At the same time, we will analyze the context in which the speakers feel the need to resort to a certain correlative pattern and the purpose of using that pattern.

Therefore, through this approach, we will complete the lack of unitary classifications regarding the CC and refute the succinct classifications, such as the one made by Avram (1960), according to which "in contemporary Romanian, correlatives are used quite rarely. They are of two kinds: correlatives of insistence (therefore) and correlatives of connection (then, then)" (Avram 1960: 93).

From the analysis of the LRC corpus, the following amounts of CC were retained:

- LRC1 – a total of 3000 CC;
- LRC 2 – a total of 3000 CC.

In order to obtain relevant results and quantitative data, we created the two micro-corpora (LRC1 – written language and LRC2 – spoken language), with an equal number of constructions.

We note that some constructions do not appear at all in LRC2 (not only ... but also, not only ... but also etc.), being thus specific to the written language, and some constructions appear rather in LRC2 (for example, ba... ba, when... when), being specific to the spoken language.

At the same time, major differences are noted in the case of CCs that introduce non-circumstantials, as they are very rare in LRC2.

In terms of their position, some subordinating correlatives can be both prepositioned and postpositioned (as, for example, in the case of the modal circumstantial the forms so... as and as... so):

We also observe identical correlative patterns in the case of the modal circumstantial and the additional predicative (CC as ... occurs in both cases).

Chapter 5 – Correlative Patterns in Coordination

Coordination presupposes the presence of an (extra)conjunctional marker and the interpretation of multiple events with the help of this marker (Dik 1968, Payne 1985, Schachter 1985, Progovac 1999, Haspelmath 2000, Skrabalova 2003, de Vries 2005, Bîlbîie 2008, Zhang 2010).

Repetitive coordinating correlatives do not have a common pattern with other linguistic elements in every language. In Dutch, for example, the repetitive correlatives be, and and nor have no quantifier role and cannot be used to modify a non-conjoined nominal group (Hendriks 2003: 38). In Romanian, instead, they can have a quantifier role and can modify both nominal groups and propositional constituents (we analyzed this aspect in subchapter 5.4.).

Also, some conjunctions are optionally/compulsorily repetitive (Zhang 2010: 303). In Romanian, at the level of coordination, the most well-known obligatory correlative pattern is either... or, the other correlative pairs being optional.

In order to provide a structured and clear view of coordinating correlatives, we will treat them differently, classifying them into homogeneous constructions and heterogeneous constructions.

A concluding observation is that, on the one hand, simple coordination involves a single event without any distributive meaning, and compound coordination, on the other hand, has the role of focus (and… and) or distributive value (both… as well as) (Tănase-Dogaru 2021: 2).

In the contemporary Romanian language, correlative patterns are present both at the intra-sentential and at the inter-sentential level. They are characterized either by the homogeneity of the terms (and... and, nor... neither, either... either, or... or, times... times, when... when, ba... ba etc .), or their heterogeneity (not only (that)...but and/but and/but and, no...but, not only...but/but/but and, both...as well as etc. .). These constructions have an emphatic character and contribute to the realization of the following types of coordination: copulative, oppositional, disjunctive, cumulative and alternative coordination. Within these correlative constructions, the first term is the correlative, anticipatory, and the second is relational.

Also, the phenomenon of double correlation is noted in the case of the construction neither... nor, which is associated with the negation no, a mandatory constituent within the CC.

In the case of constructions such as... and, or... or, or... or, there are semantic differences between their non-correlative and correlative use. The correlative use emphasizes the idea of cumulation/exclusion.

Regarding disjunctive constructions, I highlighted the fact that they can only be homogeneous, since heterogeneous/hybrid constructions of the type *either... or do not correspond to the literary norm.

A problematic aspect regarding these constructions is the inclusion of terms in the adverbial class vs. conjunction, presented in section 5.4.5. Presenting several meanings in this sense and taking syntactic aspects into account, we opted for the inclusion of terms from homogeneous constructions in the adverbial class.

At the same time, in order to illustrate the current trends of the Romanian language, we also reviewed some erroneous uses of CC, most deviations deriving from CC both... and ("reinterpreted" in the form as... both and, both ... but, both... and).

Chapter 6 – Correlative patterns in subordination

At the level of inter-sentential subordination, two types of correlative constructions can be noted with regard to the introduction of propositional adjuncts.

First of all, we are dealing with constructions made up of a conjunction (relative adverbial connector: when, where, how) and a temporal, spatial or modal adverb, which are part of relative propositional adjuncts. Secondly, the presence of constructions made up of a primary or locutional adverb and a subordinating conjunction is observed, which appear in the introduction of conjunctive propositional adjuncts (consecutive, concessive, conditional, final and causal adjuncts).

Constructions with isolated correlative (called by Chircu 2008: 24 "discontinuous relations") are constructions in which the subordinate is isolated from the correlative and is either in antecedent or in postposition. Depending on the position of the correlative, Chircu (2008: 24) describes anticipatory and reluent correlatives. The anticipatory correlatives stand before the regent, being some "signalizers" (Neamțu 1982: 507), and the repeating correlatives stand after the regent, resuming the semantic information and representing a mark of insistence, an idea also expressed by Diaconescu (1995: 216): "At the syntagmatic level , a basic unit is resumed by a correlative, when it is preceded by the regent, and the speaker wants to insist on its syntactic position".

Bejan (1979: 47) states that this type of correlation is made between the same adverbs or between different adverbs, and correlatives can be optional or obligatory. In the present case, the correlatives have an optional status, their use being relevant only at the level of maintaining the relationship between the subordinate and the regent. Chircu (2008: 24), for his part, supports the optionality of these constructions: "In general, they are optional, but often their use is imposed

by what we call the atmosphere of the statement." There are situations where correlatives are mandatory (in the case of CC comparatives as much as... as much as, as much as... as much).

Through the following examples, we want to illustrate both the optionality of correlatives and their double use (as anticipators and as repeaters). Our examples will contradict Avram's (2007: 235) statement: "correlatives are used only when the subordinate precedes the regent". We will see, therefore, that they are either before or after the regent.

Within the correlative constructions, the constructions with the non-isolated correlative, placed in the vicinity of the connector (as we will see in the given examples, are most often placed in the immediate vicinity of the connector), as Gheorghe also observes (2018: 225).

This phenomenon is viewed by Vasilescu (2012: 721) as a tendency to merge into a single grammatical unit. Also, some linguists consider these structures welded, because the correlative and the connector become close, they take the form of adverbial locutions (GA 1966 I: 386).

The interpretation of non-isolated constructions can be done from the perspective of focus, the correlative lexicalizing the result of the relative adverbial group or being an appositive element: "we opt for treating the correlative from non-isolated constructions as a focusing constituent, which lexicalizes the result of the relative adverbial group, or as an autonomous constituent, appositive base for relative, while the non-isolated correlative is considered a special type of "antecedent" of the adverbial relative (a specifier of the empty head to which the relative is attached). From the point of view of the function of the correlative within the informational organization, it is a marked, emphatic constituent" (Gheorghe 2018: 170).

In the examples from the contemporary Romanian language, these constructions are made up of pairs of relative adverbs and demonstrative adverbs, being thus compatible at a categorical level, like the isolated constructions described in the previous point. These two types of adverbs are semantically congruent, referring to temporal, spatial or modal aspects.

Subordinating correlatives are syntactic constructions that connect the subordinate clauses with the governing ones, clarifying the semantic and syntactic relations between them. Correlative elements can be relative pronouns, relative adverbs, or various conjunctions. First of all, subordinating correlatives contribute to textual coherence and cohesion by establishing logical and semantic relations between sentences, most of them expressing the circumstances/context in which a certain event takes place.

Most of the time, propositional adjuncts are co-current with correlative elements inserted in the governing clause. In some situations the presence of correlatives is optional, but there are also situations where correlatives are mandatory in certain structures (in consecutive ones, for example).

Subordinating CCs (regardless of whether they appear at the level of non-circumstantials/circumstantials) are essential grammatical structures in expressing the interdependence relationship between sentences. Some constructions (such as comparatives) allow the creation of statements that not only convey certain information, but also establish logical information between the different elements of communication.

Through these constructions, speakers can express comparisons, proportions and other complex relationships, which contribute to the expressive diversity of the language.

Chapter 7 – Semantic and categorical inconsistencies. "Asymmetrical" constructions

Constructions that present semantic incongruities are "asymmetrical" constructions (Gheorghe 2018: 165), which appear both within the adverbial system and within the conjunctional system.

In some cases, as Gheorghe (2018: 171) states, the "semantic slide" of the correlative leads to the recategorization of the relative connector into the conjunctional connector.

Also, syntactic connectors often relate to semantic correlatives (for example, Chircu (2008: 25) states that, in the case of syntactic connectors that introduce a temporal subordinator of antecedence, some relate to semantic correlatives, such as and, on the spot, where, how, quickly, just because), situations in which they are de-semanticized and re-semanticized depending on the connector.

Classifying temporal correlatives, Chircu (2008: 25) claims that, in addition to proper adverbs, there are also adverbs (locutions) that have changed their primary meaning (in place, how, where) and notes that these are no longer elements of interpropositional connection. Subordinates containing the temporal correlatives how and where appear mainly in writers who capitalize on "structures specific to popular and familiar speech" (Chircu 2008: 24). The two relative adverbs become correlative and de-semantic becoming adverbs of time and keeping the primordial morphological value (the adverbial one). Philippide (1897: 114), for his part, observes - based on a corpus made up of the literary works of Ion Creangă and Petre Ispirescu - in the chapter related to conjunctions that where "sometimes has the meaning of an adverb".

Semantic/categorical incongruities refer especially to temporal, causal, conditional, measure modal and oppositional constructions and appear at the level of asymmetric constructions, less in LRC than symmetric ones. This can be summarized as follows:

(i) **Temporal constructions**– how...how, how...immediately, how...just here, how...once, how...immediately, if...immediately;

(ii) **Causal constructions**– how... since what, why... since what;

(iii)Conditional constructions – when... then;

(iv)Modal constructions of measure – why... why, why... that's why;

(v) Oppositional constructions – if... on the contrary, while... on the contrary, where... instead.

Chapter 8 – Pragmatic particularities of constructions with correlatives

The interpretation of correlatives from a pragmatic point of view complements both the one-sided view of them and the succinct classifications. Among these classifications, we note the one made by Avram (1960: 93), according to which "in contemporary Romanian, correlatives are used quite rarely. They are of two kinds: correlatives of insistence (therefore) and correlatives of connection (then, then)". By means of the term "insistence" - also mentioned in GBLR (2010: 350) -, from a pragmatic point of view, the emphasis is placed on the instance of the speaker/speaker, who intends to highlight a certain aspect of the transmitted message, using "units of resumption" (Diaconescu 1989: 174).

At the discursive level, correlatives of the type in the first place, in the second place, on the one hand, on the other hand are observed, which contribute to the coherence of the text and to the orientation of the reader.

On the other hand, the interpretation of non-isolated constructions can be done from the perspective of focusing, the correlative lexicalizing the result of the relative adverbial group or being an appositive element: "we opt for the treatment of the correlative from non-isolated constructions as a focusing constituent, which lexicalizes the result of the relative adverbial group, or as a constituent autonomous, appositive base for the relative, while the non-isolated correlative is considered a special type "antecedent" of the adverbial relative (a specifier of the empty head to which the relative is attached). From the point of view of the function of the correlative within the informational organization, it is a marked, emphatic constituent" (Gheorghe 2018: 225).

Also, depending on the position of the correlative, Chircu (2008: 24) distinguishes anticipatory and repeating correlatives. The anticipatory correlatives stand before the regent, being some "signalizers" (Neamțu 1982: 507), and the repeating correlatives stand after the regent, resuming the semantic information and representing a mark of insistence, an idea also expressed by Diaconescu (1995: 216): "At the syntagmatic level , a basic unit is resumed by a

correlative, when it is preceded by the regent, and the speaker wants to insist on its syntactic position".

A special situation is the double correlation phenomenon. In this case, "the correlative is also associated with a restrictive operator, without constraints regarding the order of the constituents" (Gheorghe 2018: 226). The order of the constituents is not influenced by the occurrence of this operator. The following example illustrates the double correlation phenomenon resulting from adding the restrictive operator only.

Thus, the restriction, on a pragmatic level, becomes a special type of insistence and focus, the effect being that of delimiting the informational content.

Bîlbîie (2008), on the other hand, considers constructions with correlatives at the phrasal coordination level and presents conjunctive correlatives, noting that they are relevant at syntactic, semantic, discursive and prosodic levels. At the discursive and prosodic level, omnisyndetic coordination is (also) emphatically marked. At the same time, these structures are compatible with the terms focus and topic, but - given the fact that the two constituents are repeated by doubling - the structure automatically receives a contrastive interpretation.

The contexts in which correlative constructions appear show a wide range of morphosyntactic and discursive uses, and there are also confusing situations, in which the morphosyntactic or discursive status of the correlative construction cannot be delimited.

In this sense, it is necessary to approach the notion of pragmaticalization and interpret the utterances in the corpus from the point of view of this process.

From the perspective of Dostie (2009: 203) (apud Bodoc 2016: 232), pragmaticalization is the process of linguistic modification through which a lexical unit (noun, verb, adjective or adverb) or a grammatical item (coordinator, subordinator) changes its category or status and becomes a pragmatic item, that is, an element that is not completely integrated into the syntactic structure of the utterance and that has a textual and interpersonal meaning.

The term pragmaticalization, in the present paper, will be used to describe the situations in which correlatives become pragmatic items, also taking into account the fact that pragmaticalization "involves the transition from one propositional status to another extra-propositional one and the reinterpretation of meaning from relational to communicative" (Bodoc 2016: 189).

From a pragmatic point of view, the head of the relative functions as "a pivot to relaunch the statement" (Gheorghe 2004: 183), i.e. the subordinate constituent does not refer to spatial, temporal or modal aspects, but continues the action started in the regent, being a continuous relative (Gheorghe 2004: 118).

Regarding CC, pragmaticalization can be analyzed in several ways.

First, CCs can acquire additional functions. For example, CC the more... the more can evolve from expressing a simple relationship of proportionality to emphasizing a contrast or intensifying a statement.

Second, through pragmaticalization, certain CCs may become fixed and standardized within the language, losing their original flexibility. For example, in LRC, the construction so... that it is used almost exclusively in a certain type of structure, being limited to the expression of extreme degree.

Also, pragmaticalization contributes to the development of CCs that serve to link the parts of a speech more closely, improving textual coherence. For example, CC neither... nor is used to express total exclusion, thus clarifying the relationships between the elements of the sentence.

CC evolves through pragmaticalization from simple syntactic structures to essential elements of pragmatic communication, acquiring additional functions and specific roles in textual cohesion. This process reflects the dynamics of language and its continuous adaptation to the communicative needs of the speaker.

For a broader analysis at a pragmatic level, we administered the questionnaire in Appendix 1 to native Romanian speakers with different sociolinguistic variables (100 participants in total).

The questions refer to speakers' intention to use a particular utterance depending on the purpose of communication. Among the given answers are both CC and non-CC variants, so that we can establish to what extent and for what purpose native speakers opt for CC/non-CC formulations. Also, some answers contain the same type of CC (disjunctive constructions, for example), to establish which are more commonly used in spoken language.

From a pragmatic point of view, there is no question of a variety of correlative patterns, the few research directions being given by dichotomies such as topic-focus, anaphora-cataphora, focal constituent-autonomous constituent. The fundamental concepts of pragmatics cannot be illustrated by the examples given from the corpus of the contemporary Romanian language. Rather, we observe a variety of discursive and emphatic use of correlatives that mark the trace of the relative and are focal constituents of it. The purpose of using these constructions is, therefore, the insistence, i.e. highlighting the informational content within the correlative, and "the two constituents function, from a pragmatic point of view, as an anaphoric or cataphoric of the relative clause (depending on the topic)" (Bodoc 2016: 57).

It can also be stated that a relevant and substantiated classification of correlatives is achievable especially at the structural, semantic and syntactic level. Thus, at least quantitatively, the formal, semantic and syntactic features precede the pragmatic ones.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have presented a complete view of CC, the analysis being carried out at the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic level. We therefore analyzed the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic values of the constituents and used the data provided by the quantitative analysis as a basis for the qualitative analysis.

The paper is organized in two parts, the first part being a presentation of the theoretical and methodological benchmarks used later in the corpus analysis, in part II. In the analysis, we treated coordinating and subordinating CCs differently, taking into account their formal and morphosyntactic characteristics.

From a formal point of view, we have shown that CC are homogeneous/heterogeneous constructions, with the correlative isolated/non-isolated by the connector. At the semantic level, we highlighted the prototypical semantic values, those of opposition, cumulation, disjunction, etc. (in the case of coordinating correlatives) and those of causality, conditionality, temporality, etc. (among subordinate correlatives). Regarding subordinating correlatives, in addition to the usual, symmetrical constructions, I also noticed certain semantic/categorical incongruities that I analyzed and exemplified in chapter 7 of this paper.

From a syntactic perspective, the focus was placed on the syntactic relationship at which CCs appear and on the syntactic autonomy/non-autonomy from which appositive or emphatic constructions result. In LRC, the subordinating relation is characterized by a variety of construction patterns through a rich system of connectors with which correlatives are associated. An important observation was related to the position of the relative relative to the correlative which is not relevant, as correlatives can move, topicalize without affecting their syntactic nature.

At the pragmatic level, we highlighted certain particularities (also) through the questionnaire administered to native speakers of the Romanian language. Both the questionnaire and the examples from the corpus show that CCs can be pragmatic connectors due to the cohesion provided to the utterance of which they are a part, contributing to highlighting the Focus and Topic type pragmatic projections.

At the same time, I also insisted in the analysis on aspects of the written language and the spoken language, offering for each linguistic phenomenon addressed examples from both micro-corpora. In order to illustrate the current trends of the Romanian language, I also highlighted certain mistakes of expression in the use of CC, explaining the possible causes that led to the occurrence of these deviations.

OWN CONTRIBUTION AND ELEMENTS OF ORIGINALITY

The own contribution stands out, first of all, through the theme of the work that has not been addressed exhaustively, the research so far only deals with certain aspects regarding CC.

A first important contribution is the classification of CCs according to their formal, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features. In the analysis, to illustrate each particularity, we have provided examples from both written and spoken language precisely to provide an overview of current trends in LRC.

In addition, all qualitative observations are accompanied by quantitative data, which shows that the observations made in the paper are not superficial or exaggerated.

Another important contribution is the contrastive-comparative approach of the contemporary Romanian language with phenomena from the English, German and Hungarian languages. Where it was possible, I pointed out certain similarities/differences regarding CC from the Romanian language and these three languages, reaching the conclusion that however the Romanian language has a specific system of CC, with significantly more semantic/categorical incongruities than the mentioned languages.

Finally, another original element in the work is the application of the questionnaire in Appendix 1 to identify pragmatic aspects that have not been explored before. The analysis of the recorded answers confirms and complements the results obtained in the corpus analysis, thus "strengthening" the observations made.

DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

The results obtained through the corpus analysis were disseminated during the doctoral studies. One means of dissemination is the publication of articles (Prosan 2022a, 2022b, 2023a, 2023b) in specialized magazines. I also presented three scientific papers (Organization of complex sentences in Romanian, Structures with correlative in contemporary Romanian, Pragmatic particularities of constructions with correlative in contemporary Romanian) and participated with papers in the following international conferences: International Conference of Doctoral Students (Bucharest , October 28-29, 2022), 22nd International Colloquium of the Department of Linguistics (Bucharest, November 18-19, 2022), Romanian Language, Literature and Culture International Conference – challenges and perspectives (Belgrade, May 25-26, 2023), LINGBAW International Conference (Lublin, October 12-13, 2023).

The research internship at the Ludwig Maximilian University in Munich in October 2023 was a productive experience regarding the theoretical part of the work, especially regarding the extensive German bibliography on correlatives. Since the Romanian bibliography in terms of correlatives is quite limited, specialized works in German compensated for this deficiency. A prestigious event that I participated in is The 51st Edition of the Romance Linguistics Seminar

(Trinity Hall, Cambridge University, January 4-5, 2024), with the paper "Comparative Correlatives in Romanian: the syntax of cu caut... cu cantul". At the same time, thanks to the novelty represented by the topic addressed, we also consider the publication of the present work at a Romanian publishing house.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF RESEARCH

Being an extensive undertaking, the research of correlatives cannot be limited to a single work, but requires a thorough approach on several levels. In this sense, we propose in the future an expansion of the corpus so that we also consider the constructions from the LRV, in order to create a history of the correlatives and to approach them contrastively according to certain periods. Thus, we can complement the present synchronic work with a diachronic work on correlatives. We also propose a research of CC from the perspective of language registers.

Another direction of research is the approach of correlatives from the perspective of Romance languages, in order to establish possible similarities/differences between correlative patterns. Although we pointed out these aspects in the coordination report, the vision should also be extended to the level of the subordination report.

Source

Written language:
Reference corpus for current Romanian: CoRoLa (http://racai.ro).
Kilgarriff, Adam, Vit Baisa, Jan Busta, Milos Jakubicek, Vojtech Kovar, Jan Michelfeit, Pavel Rychly, Vit Suchomel. The Sketch Engine: ten years on. Lexicography, 1:7-36, 2014.

Spoken language:
Dascălu Jinga, Laurenția, 2002: Corpus of Spoken Romanian, Oscar Print Publishing House, Bucharest.
Hoarță Cărăușu, Luminița, 2013: Corpus of current non-dialectal spoken Romanian language, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Publishing House, Iași.
Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana (coord.), 2002: Verbal interaction in the current Romanian language. Selective corpus. Typology sketch, Bucharest University Publishing House.
Pop, Liana, Corpus in Romanian - forums.
Reference corpus for current Romanian: CoRoLa (http://racai.ro).

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABEILLÉ, Anne, BORSLEY D. Robert, ESPINAL Maria-Teresa, 2006: „The syntax of comparative correlatives in French and Spanish" in *Proceedings of HPSG*, nr. 06, pp. 6-26.

ARAPOFF, Nancy, 1968: „The Semantic Role of Sentence Connectors in Extra-Sentence Logical Relationships", in *TESOL Quarterfly*, vol. 2, nr. 4, pp. 243-252.

ARSENIJEVIC, Boban, 2009: „{Relative {conditional {correlative clauses}}}", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1)*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 131-156.

ASHER, Nicholas, Laure VIEU, 2005: „Subordinating and coordinating discourse relations" in *Lingua*, vol. 115, nr. 4, pp. 591-610.

AXEL-TOBER, Katrin, 2002: „Zur diachronen Entwicklung der syntaktischen Integration linksperipherer Adverbialsaetze im Deutschen. Ein Beispiel für syntaktischen Wandel?", in *Beitraege zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, nr. 124, pp. 1-43.

BÁCSKAI-ATKÁRI, Júlia, Éva DÉKÁNY, 2014: „From non-finite to finite subordination. The history of embedded clauses", in *The evolution of functional left peripheries in Hungarian syntax*, Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 148-223.

BALUSU, Rahul, 2021: The Dravidian Correlative and the Disjunction Marker, in *Proceedings of FASAL 9*, Portland, pp. 1-17.

BEJAN, Dumitru, 1979: „Adverbele de mod în poziție corelativă" în *Cercetări de lingvistică*, Institutul de Lingvistică şi Istorie Literară, Cluj-Napoca, pp. 47-52.

BELYAEV, Olga, Dag HAUG, 2014: „Pronominal coreference in Ossetic correlatives and the syntax-semantics interface", in *Proceedings of LGC 14 Conference*, Stanford, pp. 89-109.

BELYAEV, Olga, Dag HAUG, 2020: „The genesis and typology of correlatives", in *Language*, Volume 96, Number 4, pp. 874-907.

BHATT, Rajesh, Roumyana, PANCHEVA, 1987: „Conditionals", in M. Everaert, H. Van Riensdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp. 129-158.

BHATT, Rajesh, 2003: „Locality in correlatives", in *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21, pp. 485-541.

BHATT, Rajesh, Anikó LIPTÁK, 2009: „Matching effects in the temporal and locative domains", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and*

Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1), John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 343-372.

BITTNER, Maria, 2001: „Topical Referents for Individuals and Possibilities", în R. Hastings, B. Jackson, and Z. Zvolenszky (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT XI*, CLC Publications, Cornell, Ithaca, pp. 36-55.

BÎLBÎIE, Gabriela, 2008: *A Syntactic Account of Romanian Correlative Coordination from a Romance Perspective*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.

BÎLBÎIE, Gabriela, 2024: *Sintaxa construcţiilor coordonate în limba română*, Editura Universităţii din București, București.

BÎTEA, Ioan, 1987: „Puncte de vedere despre coordonarea disjunctivă" în *Limba română*, an 36, nr. 1, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, pp. 377-387.

BLÜHDORN, Hardarik, 2007: „Epistemische Lesarten von Satzkonnektoren – Wie sie zustande kommen und wie man sie erkennt", in *Semantik vs. Pragmatik oder Semantik und Pragmatik?*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, pp. 217-251.

BLÜHDORN, Hardarik, 2008: „Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics, and discourse: Evidence from the study of connectives" în C. Fabricius-Hasen, W. Ramm (eds.) *Subordination versus Coordination in Sentence and Text*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 59-88.

BODOC, Alice, 2015: „Statutul polifuncţional al jonctivului *cum* în limba română veche" în R. Zafiu, I. Nedelcu (ed.) *Variaţia lingvistică: probleme actuale. Actele celui de-al 14-lea Colocviu Internaţional al Departamentului de Lingvistică*, Editura Universităţii din București, pp. 141-149.

BORSLEY, Robert D., 2004: „On the periphery: Comparative correlatives in Polish and English". In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 12, pp. 59-90.

BORSLEY, Robert D., 2005: „Against conjp", in *Lingua*, vol. 115, nr. 4, pp. 461-482.

BRANCHINI, Chiara, Caterina DONATI 2009: „Italian Sign Language relative clauses in a typological perspective", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1*), John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 157-191.

BRAȘOVEANU, Adrian, 2008: „Comparative Correlatives as Anaphora to Differentials" în R. Hastings, B. Jackson, and Z. Zvolenszky (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT XI*, CLC Publications, Cornell, Ithaca, pp. 126-143.

BRAȘOVEANU, Adrian, 2008: „Uniqueness Effects in Correlatives", în A. Grønn (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 12*, ILOS, Oslo, pp. 47-65.

BREINDL, Eva, 2006: „Quer durch die Wortarten rings um die Phrasensyntax mitten in die Semantik: komplexe Lokalisationsausdrücke im Deutschen", in *Grammatische*

Untersuchungen, Analysen und Reflexionen. Festschrift für Gisela Zifonun, Tübingen, pp. 339-358.

CABLE, Seth, 2009: „The syntax of the Tibetan correlative", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1)*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 195-222.

CHIRCU, Adrian, 2008: „Despre adverbele corelative temporale" în *Dinamica limbii, dinamica interpretării*, Actele celui de-al 7-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de limba română (7-8 decembrie 2007), Editura Universității din București, pp. 23-30.

CHIRCU, Adrian, 1998: „Observații asupra lui *cum* cauzal" în *Studii și cercetări lingvistice XLIX*, Editura Academiei, București, p. 61.

CHIRILĂ, Adina, 2022: „Observații despre uzul locuțiunii conjuncționale *dar și* în limba română actuală" în *Diacronia* 15, pp. 1-5.

CHUNG, Daeho, 2004: „Semantics and syntax of correlative adverbs", în *Studies in generative grammar*, Korean Generative Grammar Circle, Seoul.

CITKO, Barbara, 2009: „What don't wh-questions, free relatives and correlatives have in common?", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1)*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 49-79.

CONSTANTINESCU-DOBRIDOR, Gheorghe, 1972: „Despre elementele corelative ale limbii române" în *Limbă și literatură*, vol. II, Editura Societatea de științe filologice din Republica Socialistă Română, București, pp. 145-152.

CRISTOFARO, Sonia, 2003: *Subordination*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

CROITOR, Blanca, 2013: „Coordonarea", în G. Pană-Dindelegan, M. Maiden, *O gramatică a limbii române altfel*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, pp. 450-512.

CROITOR, Blanca, 2016: „Coordination and coordinating conjunctions" în *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford University Press, pp. 444-462.

CULICOVER, Peter, Jackendoff, Ray, 1999: „The view from periphery: The English comparative correlative" în *Linguistic Inquiry*, pp. 543-571.

DAYAL, Veneeta, 1995: „Quantification in Correlatives", in *Quantification in Natural Languages*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 179-205.

DAVISON, Alice, 2009: „Adjunction, features and locality in Sanskrit and Hindi/Urdu correlatives", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1)*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 223-262.

DEMIROK, Ömer. 2017. „Acompositional semantics for Turkish correlatives", in *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)*, nr. 34, pp. 159–66.

DEN DIKKEN, Marcel, 2005: „Comparative Correlatives Comparately" în *Linguistic Inquiry*, nr. 36, pp. 497-532.

DEN DIKKEN, Marcel, 2006: „*Either*-float and the syntax of co-*or*-dination", in *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, nr. 24, vol. 3, pp. 689-749.

DEN DIKKEN, Marcel, 2009: „Comparative correlatives and successive cyclicity", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1)*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 263-306.

DE VRIES, Mark, 2002: *The syntax of relativization*, LOT, Amsterdam.

DE VRIES, Mark, 2005: „Coordination and Syntactic Hierarchy", in Studia Linguistica, vol. 59, nr.1, pp. 83-105.

DIACONESCU, Ion, 1995: *Sintaxa limbii române*, Editura Enciclopedică, București.

DIACONESCU, Ion, 1989: *Probleme de sintaxă a limbii române actuale*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.

DOWNING, Bruce, 1973: „Correlative relative clauses in universal grammar", in *Minnesota Working Papers in Linguistics and Philosophy of Language*, No. 2, University of Minnesota, Minnesota, pp. 1-17.

DRAȘOVEANU, D. D., 1968: „Observații asupra cuvintelor relaționale", în *Cercetări Lingvistice*, XIII, nr. 1, pp. 19-32.

EROMS, Hans-Werner, 2000: *Syntax der deutschen Sprache*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

FELSER, Claudia, Anna JESSEN, 2021, Correlative Coordination and Variable Subject-Verb Agreement in German in *Languages*, vol. 6, nr. 2, pp. 1-20.

FREY, Werner, André MEINUNGER, Kerstin SCHWABE, 2016: „Sentential proforms. An overview", în *Inner-sentential Propositional Proforms: Syntactic properties and interpretative effects*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

GĂITĂNARU, Ștefan, 2016: „Aspecte ale coordonării prin joncțiune în limba română veche" în *Diacronia*, nr. 3, Editura Academiei, București. pp. 1-17.

GHEORGHE, Mihaela, 2004: *Propoziția relativă*, Editura Paralela 45, București, Pitești, Brașov.

GHEORGHE, Mihaela, 2018: „Observații pe marginea unor construcții cu corelativ în limba română veche" în G. Pană-Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu și Isabela Nedelcu (coord.), *Studii lingvistice. Omagiu Valeriei Guțu Romalo*, Editura Universității din București, pp. 167-175.

HAEGEMAN, Liliane, 1985: „Subordinating conjunctions and X' Syntax", *Studia Germanica Gandensia* 2, pp. 1-42.

HAEGEMAN, Liliane, 2012: *Adverbial clauses, main clause phenomena, and composition of the left periphery: The carthograph of syntactic structures,* vol. 8, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

HASPELMATH, Martin, 2004: *Coordinating Constructions*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

HASPELMATH, Martin, 2007: „Coordination", in Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

HEIM, Irene, 1990: „Presupposition Projection and the Semantics of Attitude Verbs", in *Journal of Semantics*, vol. 9, pp. 183-221.

HENDRIKS, Petra, 2003: „*Either* as a focus particle", in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, pp. 450-489.

HENDRIKS, Petra, 2004: „Either, both and neither in coordinate structure" în A. Meulen și W. Abraham, *The Composition of Meaning*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

HENNIG, Mathilde, 2016: *Komplexe Attribuiton. Ein Nominalstilphaenomen aus sprachhistorischer, typologischer und funktionalstilistischer Perspektive*, De Gruyter, Berlin.

HILL, Virginia, 2002: „Adhering Focus", in *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 33, nr. 1, pp. 164-172.

HILL, Virginia, 2004: „On left periphery and focus", in *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 339-354.

HILL, Virginia, Olga MISESKA-TOMIC, 2009: *A typology of subjunctive complements in Balkan languages*, Editura Universității din București, București.

HJELMSLEV, Louis, 1933: *Structure générale des corrélations linguistiques*, in L. Hjelmslev 1973, pp. 57-98.

HOARȚĂ CĂRĂUȘU, Luminița, 2009: „Aspecte ale problematicii circumstanțialului", în *Text și discurs religios*, Lucrările Conferinței Naționale, nr. 1, pp. 415-428.

HODIȘ, Viorel, 1990: *Apoziția și propoziția apozitivă*, Editura Științifică, București.

HOFFMANN, Thomas, 2019: *English Comparative Correlatives: Diachronic and Synchronic Variation at the Lexicon-Syntax Interface (Studies in English Language)*, Editura Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

HOFMEISTER, Philip, 2008: „A linearization account of *either…or* constructions" în *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, Springer Science + Business Media, Pennsylvania.

HOLLER, Anke, 2013: „Reanalyizing German Correlative *es*", in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, pp. 90-109.

HOPPER, Paul J., Elizabeth Close TRAUGOTT, 2003: *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge University Press.

HORVÁTH, Júlia, 1986: *Focus in the theory of grammar and syntax of Hungarian*, Foris, Dordrecht.

ILIESCU, Ada, 2008: *Gramatica practică a limbii române actuale*, Editura Corint, București.

IONESCU-RUXĂNDOIU, Liliana, 1991: *Naraţiune şi dialog în proza românească. Elemente de pragmatică a textului literar*, Editura Academiei, București.

IZVORSKI, Roumyana, 1996: „The Syntax and Semantics of Correlative Proforms", in North East Linguistics Society, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 133-148.

JIANU, Maria-Magdalena, 2004-2005: „Alte realizări ale relaţiei sintactice de coordonare. Coordonarea cumulativă şi cea negativă", in *Dacoromania. Serie nouă*, IX-X, Editura Academiei, Cluj-Napoca, pp. 259-266.

JOHANNESSEN, Janne Bondi, 1998: *Coordination*, Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax.

JOHANNESSEN, Janne Bondi, 2005: „The syntax of the corelative adverbs" în *Lingua*, Science Direct, Oslo, pp. 419-443.

JOFFRE, M.D., 2004: „Ita, tam, tantus, talis: entre anaphore et corrélation" în C. BODELOT (éd.), *Anaphore, cataphore et corrélation en latin*, Publication de l'Université de Clermont-Ferrand.

KAYNE, Richard S., 2002: „Pronouns and their Antecedents" in *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, Blackwell Publishers.

KÁNTOR, Gergely, 2008: „Komparativ korrelativ szerkezetek a magyarban", in *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, nr. 105, pp. 134-163.

KISS, Katalin, 2002: *The syntax of Hungarian*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

KORTMANN, Bernd, 1997: *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

KORTMANN, Bernd, 1998: „Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe", in *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, Mouton de Gruyer, Berlin.

KNOTT, Alistair, Jon OBERLANDER, Mick O'DONNELL, Chris MELLISH, 2001: „Beyond elaboration: The interaction of relations and focus in coherent text", in *Text Representation: Linguistic and psycholinguistic aspects*, John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 181-196.

LANG, Ewald, 1984: *The semantics of coordination*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

LANG, Ewald, 2000: „Copular and AUX-Constructions", in *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 16, pp. 31-68.

LAPPIN, Shalom, N. FRANCEZ, 1994: „E-type pronouns, i-sums, and donkey anaphora", in *Linguistics and Philosophy* 17, pp. 391-428.

LARSON, Richard Kurth, 1985: „On the syntax of disjunction scope" in *National Language Linguist Theory,* vol. 3, pp. 217-264.

LARSON, Richard, 1990: „Extraction and multiple selection in PP", in *The Linguistic Review* 7, pp. 169-182.

LEUNG, Tommi Tsz-Cheung, 2009: „On the matching requirement in correlatives", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1)*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 309-341.

LINKS, Meta, Ans van KEMENADE, Stefan GRONDELAERS, 2017: „Correlatives in earlier English: Change and continuity in the expression of interclausal dependencies", în *Language Variation and Change,* volume 29, Issue 3, pp. 365-392.

LIPTÁK, Anikó, 2001: *On the syntax of WH-items in Hungarian* (dissertation), Leiden University.

LIPTÁK, Anikó, 2005: „The left periphery of Hungarian exclamatives", in *Contributions to the thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, pp. 161-185.

LIPTÁK, Anikó, 2008: „On the correlative nature of Hungarian left-peripheral relatives", in *Dislocated elements in discourse: Syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives*, ed. By Benjamin Shaer, Philippa Cook, Werner Frey, and Claudia Maienborn, Routledge, London, pp. 398–430.

LIPTÁK, Anikó, 2009 (ed.): *Correlatives Cross-linguistically,* John Benjamin Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

MARIN, Marian, 2020: „Construcții corelative în sintaxa graiurilor românești din Banatul sârbesc" în *Diacronia,* XXXIX, Editura Academiei, București, pp. 87-94

MCCAWLEY, James D., 1988: „The comparative conditional construction in English, German, and Chinese", In Shelley Axmaker, Annie Jaisser & Helen Singmaster (eds.), *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp. 176–187.

MCCLOSKEY, James, 2002: „Resumption, Successive Cyclicity, and the Locality of Operations", in *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp. 184-226.

MEINUNGER, André, 2018: «*Je-desto*-Satzgefüge als kanonische Verb-zweit-Saetze", in *Mittelpunkt Deutsch*, ZAS Berlin, pp. 1-20.

MERMIN, Lillian, 1943: „On the Placement of Correlatives in Modern English", in *American Speech*, vol. 18, nr. 3, Duke University Press, pp. 171-191.

MIGNON, Françoise, 2009: „Histoire du terme corrélation dans la grammaire française" în *Langages*, nr. 174 (2), Larousse, pp. 13-24.

MITCHELL, Bruce, 1985: „Correlation and anticipation", în *Old English syntax: Concord, the parts of speech, and the sentence*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 774-778.

MOLTMANN, Friederike, 1992: „Reciprocals and Same/Different. Towards a Semantic Analysis", in *Linguistics and Philosophy*, vol. 15, nr. 4, pp. 411-462.

MOURET, Francois, 2004: „The syntax of French conjunction doubling" in *Proceedings from the annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, vol. 40, nr. 2, pp. 193-207.

MOURET, Francois, 2007: „Grammaire des constructions coordonnées. Coordinations simples et coordinations a redoublement en francais contemporain", Université Paris-Diderot.

MUNN, Alan Boag, 1993: *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures* (doctoral dissertation), University of Maryland.

MÜLLER, Stefan, 1996: *Deutsche Syntax Deklarativ: Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar für das Deutsche*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.

NEAMȚU, Gavrilă G., 1982: „Observații asupra conjuncțiilor corelative disjunctive", în *Limba română*, an XXXI, nr. 6, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, pp. 505-513.

NORDSTRÖM, Jackie, 2010: *Modality and subordinators*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

O'DOWD, Elizabeth, 1992: „The syntactic metaphor of subordination: A typological study", in *Lingua*, vol. 86, nr. 1, pp. 47-80.

PANĂ-DINDELEGAN, Gabriela (ed.), 2013: *The Grammar of Romanian,* Editura Oxford University Press, Oxford.

PHILIP, Joy Naomi, 2012: *Subordinating and Coordinating Linkers*, teză de doctorat, UCL, accesat în data de 25.02.2024, https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1349441/.

PROGOVAC, Ljiljana, 1998: „Structure for coordination" in *Glot international*, vol. 3, nr. 7, pp. 3-6.

PROGOVAC, Ljiljana, 1999: „Events and Economy of Coordination", in *Syntax: A Journal of Theoretical, Experimental and Interdisciplinary Research*, vol. 2, nr. 2, pp. 141-159.

RADFORD, Andrew, 1988: *Transformational Grammar*, Cambridge University Press.

RADU, Carmen-Ioana, 2020: „*De unde până unde* – un conector nonlogic cu valoare pragmatică", în *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, LXXI (2), Editura Academiei, București, pp. 255-263.

REBUSCHI, Georges, 2009: „Basque correlatives and their kin in the history of Northern Basque", In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically (Language Faculty and*

Beyond: Internal and External Variation in Linguistics 1), John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 81-130.

RIZEA, Monica-Mihaela, 2017: *Cuvântul de negaţie nici*, Handout – Master's program in Linguistics, Bucureşti.

RIZESCU, Ion, 1962: *Observaţii asupra propoziţiilor subordonate relative din „Carte cu învăţătură" (1581)*, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, Iaşi.

RUDIN, Catharine, 2006: „Multiple WH Fronting, Free Relatives, Correlatives, and the [+MFS] Split", IULC Lecture, Indiana University, Bloomington.

SACHS, Konstantin, 2016: *A Movement Approach for Multi-Head Correlatives*, Editura Universității Eberhard Karl, Tübingen.

SANCHEZ LOPEZ, Cristina, 2017: „Coordination and correlatives", in *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, pp. 647-688.

SCHECKER, Michael, 2000: „Zur kommunikativ-funktionalen Leistung von Nebensaetzen", in *Subordination in Syntax, Semantik und Textlinguistik*, Tübingen, pp. 115-122.

SCHWARZ, Bernhard, 1999: „On the Syntax of *either... or*", in *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, vol. 17, pp. 339-370.

SKRABALOVA, Hana, 2003: „La syntaxe de la coordination [Conj DP Conj DP]: comparaison entre le francais, le tehéque et l'anglais", paper presented at the Workshop on coordination, University Paris 7, 1 March 2003.

SPORTICHE, Dominique, 1996: „Clitic Constructions", in *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, pp. 213-276.

SRIVASTAV, Veneeta, 1991: „The syntax and semantics of correlatives", in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* vol. 9, nr. 4, pp. 637-686.

STAN, Camelia, 1989: „Un tip de structuri sintactice cu elemente corelative în limba română" în *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, Bucureşti, pp. 40-43.

STASSEN, Leon, 2000: „AND-Languages and WITH-Languages" in *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 4, pp. 1-54.

STERNEFELD, Wolfgang, 2006: *Syntax: eine morphologisch motivierte generative Beschreibung des Deutschen*, vol. 2, Stauffenburg.

SUDHOFF, Stefan, 2003: *Argumentsaetze und es-Korrelate: zur syntaktischen Struktur von Nebensatzeinbettungen im Deutschen*, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, Berlin.

TĂNASE-DOGARU, Mihaela, 2021, „On the English and Romanian correlatives 'both…and', 'atât...cât', în *Exploring Language Variation, Diversity and Change*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 4-21.

TEODORESCU, Ecaterina, 1972: *Propoziţia subiectivă*, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti.

WEGENER, H., 2000: „Asymetrische Koordination in subordinierten Strukturen", in *Subordination in Syntax, Semantik und Textlinguistik*, Stauffenburg, Tübingen, pp. 33-44.

WEGERER, Martina, 2012: *Die Numeruskongruenz von Subjekt und finitem Verb im Deutschen*, University of Vienna, teză de doctorat.

ZAFIU, Rodica, 2005: „Conjuncțiile adversative în limba română: tipologie și niveluri de incidență", în *Limba română, structură și funcționare – Actele celui de al 4-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de Limba Română*, Editura Universității din București.

ZAFIU, Rodica, 2012: „Conectorii disjunctivi din perspectivă semantico-pragmatică: Ipoteze asupra proceselor de gramaticalizare" în *Limba română LXI*, Editura Academiei, București, pp. 417-423.

ZIFONUN, Gisela, Ewald LANG, 1995: *Deutsch – typologisch*, De Gruyter, Berlin.

ZIFONUN, Gisela, 2001: *Grammatik des Deutschen im europaeischen Vergleich. Der Relativsatz*, Institut für deutsche Sprache, Mannheim.

ZITTERBART, Jussara Paranhos, 2002: *Zur korrelativen Subordination im Deutschen*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.

ZHANG, Niina, 2007: „The syntactic derivations of two paired dependency constructions" in Lingua, vol. 117, nr. 12, pp. 2134-2158.

ZHANG, Niina, 2008: „Gapless relative clauses as clausal licensors of relational nouns" in *Language and Linguistics*, vol. 9, nr. 4, pp. 1003-1026.

ZHANG, Niina, 2010: *Coordination in Syntax*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

ZOBEL, Sarah, 2015: „Voldemort phrases in generic sentences", in *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 83, pp. 107-123.