


Gunel Imran Eyvazli  <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2568-094X>
Azerbaijan University of Languages
e-mail: e.n.g.i@rambler.ru

Lexical and grammatical means of communication between text components

Leksykalne i gramatyczne środki komunikacji między składnikami tekstu

Abstract

The article discusses the means of communication between the components of the semantic structure of English language text. The structural and semantic features of sentences that make up a complex syntactic whole are especially highlighted. Special attention is paid to the problem of the interrelation of sentences in the compositional and semantic structure of a complex syntactic whole. The semantic connection between the previous context and subsequent sentences of the text is carried out by lexical and grammatical means of communication. Proper use of these means of communication plays an important role in text formation. The text as a whole speech product and its separate units are treated of only through the concept of coherence. Researchers certainly emphasize this feature of the text, focusing on external means of creating coherence. As a rule, linguistic communication signals of sentences sequences are considered within the framework of a single whole. However, the concept of coherence presupposes not only the presence of external signs of the cohesion of sentences, but also the presence of an internal, semantic, deep connection of all the meanings (or most of the meanings) that make up a text fragment. The linguistic approach to the text is aimed at revealing the typical structure of any text in general, its linguistic, structural and compositional formality.

Keywords: text components, cohesion, complex syntactic whole, means of communication, retro-fact, intro-fact, anaphor, cataphor

Streszczenie

W artykule omówiono środki komunikacji między składnikami struktury semantycznej tekstu w oparciu o materiał języka angielskiego. Podkreślono cechy strukturalne i semantyczne zdań, które składają się na złożoną całość składniową. Szczególną uwagę zwraca się na problem wzajemnych powiązań zdań w strukturze

kompozycyjnej i semantycznej złożonej całości składniowej. Semantyczne połączenie między poprzednim kontekstem a kolejnymi zdaniem tekstu odbywa się za pomocą leksykalnych i gramatycznych środków komunikacji. Właściwe wykorzystanie tych środków komunikacji odgrywa ważną rolę w tworzeniu tekstu. Tekst jako całość produktu mowy i jego oddzielne jednostki są traktowane tylko przez pojęcie spójności. Badacze podkreślają tę cechę tekstu, koncentrując się na zewnętrznych środkach tworzenia spójności. Z reguły sygnały komunikacji językowej sekwencji zdań są rozpatrywane w ramach jednej całości. Pojęcie spójności zakłada jednak nie tylko obecność zewnętrznych znaków spójności zdań, ale także obecność wewnętrznego, semantycznego, głębokiego połączenia wszystkich znaczeń (lub większości znaczeń), które składają się na fragment tekstu. Podejście językowe do tekstu ma na celu ujawnienie typowej struktury każdego tekstu w ogóle, jego formalności językowej, strukturalnej i kompozycyjnej.

Słowa kluczowe: składowe tekstu, spójność, złożona całość składniowa, środki komunikacji, retrofakt, introfakt, anafora, katafora

Introduction

The recognition of a text as a unit of the highest level of the linguistic system directs all efforts of linguists to search for the common ground that forms the foundations of certain texts, the formulas and rules by which they are built. For the text theory, the crucial task seems to be “not the creation of an integral construct, but the differentiation of text types, the accumulation of knowledge about their properties and the construction of a typology of text on this basis” (Гуревиц/Gurevič, 2007). Highlighting the categories of text and considering their functioning in texts of various communicative orientations will greatly help clarify the status of the text as an object of linguistic investigations.

Various differential features, or “grammatical” categories, are proposed as the basis for the typology of the text; attempts are being made to propose a classification of text categories (Abdullayev, 1998; Абдуллаев/Abdullayev, 1983; Гальперин/Gal’perin, 1977; Николаева/Nikolaeva, 2012; Тураева/Turaeva, 1986). Despite the diversity of opinions of linguists about the structural organization of the text, it should be noted the absolute unity of researchers is observed on the point that coherence is the main feature of the text. Actually, the linguistics of the text originated from the analysis of the types and means of communication between independent sentences. However, as an object of research, the category of coherence has recently attracted the attention of linguists relatively (Гальперин/Gal’perin, 1981; Кручинина/Kruchinina, 1982; Ноздрина/Nozdrina, 1981; Halliday, 1976).

The category of cohesion is closely related to the concept of text structure. It should be noted that the structure is a way of interconnection, interaction of its constituent components (Виноградов/Vinogradov, 1963). There is no consensus on the problem of the component structure of the text. Nevertheless, most linguists recognize Complex Syntactic Whole (CSW) as “directly composing” the text.

It was the great interest in the types and means of communication at the supra-phrasal level that led linguists to identify cohesion as a formal semantic category of text. The term „cohesion” in this sense expresses the process of text unfolding in its entirety and reflects both the substantive and structural aspects of its organization. If the study of the content of the cohesion category involves the analysis of the logical and semantic relations be-

tween the correlated components, then the consideration of the expression of this category involves the identification of linguistic means that are “signals in terms of expression” of the cohesion category (Кручинина/Kruchinina, 1982). As Halliday notes, “cohesion is a part of the system of a language. The potential for cohesion lies in the systematic resources that are embedded in the language itself” (Halliday, 1976).

It was Halliday, together with Hassan, who first attempted to identify a system of formal means of cohesion based on modern English texts. It should be noted that the author uses the term “cohesion” in a narrow sense, actually extending it to a group of sentences, that is, within the CSW. Meanwhile, it seems quite obvious that a wide variety of linguistic means can be used at the textual level, capable of expressing a semantic connection between correlated CSW. On the other hand, even traditional, “systemic” means of communication can acquire additional or new meanings and perform unusual functions in the text, which is explained by the special nature of the system inherent in the text as a speech product (Гальперин/Gal’perin, 1977; Кухаренко/Kuharenko, 1988; Николаева/Nikolaeva, 2012).

Findings

At the CSW level, semantic-syntactic contact between sentences can be achieved through different types of cohesion: conference, anaphora, cataphora, substitution, determination, and connection. Our focus is on connection, which is carried out by various lexical and grammatical means of communication. Not only individual lexeme can act as a means of communication, but also stable expressions can perform a union function.

To determine the means of communication, we will use three criteria: 1) semantic, 2) structural, and 3) functional.

Semantically, means of communication are a class of words that have one common denominator – a relation, or a connection. Structurally, they have an invariant form (in rare cases, limited variability). At the same time, we exclude from consideration cases of free word combinations, as well as such predicative units as “*that is why*”, “*that is (to say)*”, “*I assume (mean)*”, which can allow a wide variability, despite their apparent structural stability. In addition, functionally, they should probably be interpreted as main parts of complex sentences. As for the means of communication, they function either parenthetically or autonomously in relation to the members of the sentence. Relevantly, we note that for some means of communication, the initial position in the sentence is obligatory (for example: *and*, *but*), and for others it is optional (for example: *however*, *though*, etc.).

Among the formal means of communication, it is possible to distinguish the following groups:

- 1) conjunctions – *and, nor, neither, or, but, though, for, so, then*, etc.;
- 2) adverbs – *still, then, then, so, also, before, however, yet, meanwhile, instead, moreover, beside, anyway, nevertheless*, etc.;
- 3) modal words and expressions – *surely, fortunately, sadly, true, of course, certainly, undoubtedly*, etc.
- 4) quantitative numbers – *one, two, three*, etc.

- 5) adverbs formed from ordinal numbers – *firstly, secondly*, etc .
- 6) introductory phraseological units – *in fact, at least, for instance (example), above all, in particular, in contrast, on the one (other) hand*, etc.

As you can see, the first five groups of means of communication are distinguished based on their belonging to a certain part of speech. If we take into account that we are talking about the same functional feature of means of communication, then it remains to assume that the existence of some homonym forms in the first and second groups – “*then*”, “*so*” – is explained by their semantic differences.

Meanwhile, Potebnya also pointed out the unreasonableness of interpreting the same lexeme as two parts of speech, “the same word cannot be an adverb and a conjunction at the same time, and if they say that the difference between these words consists only in the syntactic meaning, then this is only a mistake. It appears to be small, but in essence it contains all the difference that can exist between words in a formal relationship” (Потебня/Potebnya, 1958).

No less difficulties arise when differentiating modal words and adverbs, since both contain a sign of modality. It is not by chance that they distinguish: 1) proper modal words: “*certainly, indeed, surely, maybe, perhaps, perhaps, of course*” and 2) adjunctive modal words: “*moreover, nevertheless, still, however, therefore, first, secondly*”, etc. [Гуревич/Gurevič, 2007; Ильиш /Il'iš, 1971).

Occupying a borderline position between old and new information, the means of communication is determined by both the preceding content of the utterance and the content of the subsequent utterance introduced by it. Otherwise, the dependence of the value of the means of communication on the retro-factum can be called an anaphoric vector, and the dependence on the intro-factum can be called a cataphoric vector. Both vectors are oppositely directed, interdependent, and represent a unity of opposites.

In the pragmatic aspect, communication between the addressee and the recipient of information is carried out through the value of the same means of communication. An indicator of addressing, or an address vector, is an implicitly or explicitly expressed by the modality of a means of communication. Consequently, a triple vector complex is fixed in the semantics of the means of communication – anaphoric, cataphoric and addressable. In this regard, it should be emphasized that the address vector is irrelevant for the semantics of the neutral means of communication “and”. The research notes that “and” performs only the syntactic function of connecting words or sentences, “which should be considered together” (Гуревич/Gurevič, 2007).

Discussion and results

Now let's define the possible types of semantic relationships between narrative sentences, which are fixed by means of communication in text formation. The means of communication “*so*”, “*therefore*”, “*subsequently*” express the causal relationship between statements. The anaphoric vector of these means of communication is directed to the cause – retro-fact, and the cataphoric vector is directed to the effect – intro-fact. In this case, the address

vector can be expressed implicitly. "With her attitude it is certain things are not going to get better for us, the people who exist at the bottom end of the scale. So we are going to need our Morning Star more than ever." (DBRS..., 2014).

The second type of semantic relationship between the retro-fact and the intro-fact of statements is called successivity. Communication tools of this type perform logical and factual functions, reflecting the sequence of events, facts, and logical operations. The indicator of successivity in the text is usually the means of communication with the meaning of enumeration – "*one*", "*two*", "*first*", "*secondly*", etc., which serve to divide the CSW into parts depending on the degree of their significance for the author. The logical connection between statements organized in this way undoubtedly facilitates the recipient's perception of information. "It is worth noticing that there are two kinds of explanation here. First, the scientist explains the objects of his study by producing scientific explanations for them. Secondly, the philosopher explains how the scientific explanations can themselves be understood." (Palmer, 1976).

The peculiarity of the "*one*" and "*first(-ly)*" means of communication is that anaphorically they imply the presence of a retro-fact, while cataphorically they indicate the initial stage in a series of successive facts of a prospective plan.

For a literary text, an important category that ensures the concreteness and realism of the description is the temporal and spatial continuum. The realization of this category is achieved by various means, one of which is the means of communication that transmit the sequence of events, phenomena, and actions of the characters.

So, "*already*", "*before*", "*earlier*", "*so far*" indicate that the events of the intro-fact precede the events of the retro-fact. The group "*to begin with*", "*at first*", etc. emphasizes not only the connection of the intro-fact with the retro-fact by the succession of events, but also the fact that the intro-fact can be two-stage, i.e. structurally represented by a complex sentence or a sequence of sentences, the parts of which are connected by means of communication "*and then*" / "*but then*". For example: "Stella's face went cold and stern for a moment as he weighed the boy up. At first he thought it was a more subtle attempt at ridicule but then he realized that this black faced young lad was genuine." (Parker, 1978).

The next group of means of communication of the "*then*" type is united by the common semantic feature "*then, later*". These include "*then*", "*later*", "*afterwards*", "*soon*", "*suddenly*", "*immediately*", "*now*", "*here*". At the beginning of the sentence, these means of communication have an indefinite and generalized meaning. "Sidney had been shouting out the tale and one by one the tavern was listening. Suddenly the place erupted into shrieks of laughter." (Parker, 1978).

And the last group of communication tools that establish a successive relationship between components includes "*finally*", "*at last*", "*in the end*". They usually introduce an intro fact of a resultant nature in relation to the events of the retro-fact.

The third type of semantic relationship between the components implements can be called a contra-fact, since in this case the means of communication "*but*", "*yet*", "*on the contrary*", "*conversely*", "*on the other hand*" explicate various kinds of oppositions between retro-fact and intro-fact. "I do not wish to imply by this that all stressed syllables in an utterance are perceived as equally prominent. On the contrary, stressed syllables

that are produced with moving pitch or high pitch will be perceived as more prominent in general than stressed syllables produced on mid or low pitch.” (Brown, 1977).

The following series of communication tools: “*also*”, “*moreover*”, “*in addition*”, etc. establishes an additive relationship between the components. The cataphorical vector of these means of communication indicates that the intro-fact is an addition to the retro-fact. “The FSO range starts at £ 2, 849 for the 1300 saloon. The includes a year’s car tax and VAT. In addition there is a 1500 saloon model which retails at £3, 049.” (DBRS..., 2014).

The fifth type of semantic relations between connected sentences are expressed with the following expressions like “*in particular*”, “*at least*”, “*for instance*” (*example*), etc. This type of relationship is determined as a specifying, or determining.

“Linguists are not the only scholars who have been interested in semantics. In particular the subject has been of interest to philosophers and psychologists.” (Palmer, 1976).

Here, the cataphorical vector of the communication means indicates the clarifying, more private nature of the intro-fact compared to the retro-fact. In other words, the means of communication implements one of the sides of the general and private relationship, namely from the general to the particular.

The other side of the relationship between the general and the particular – from the particular to the general – is reflected in the sixth type of communication of the narrative sentences of the CSW, performed by means of communication “*in general*”, “*generally*”, “*all in all*”, “*overall*”, etc. In this generalizing type of communication, the retro-fact is a detail, a particular factor that underlies the result or generalization expressed in the intro-fact. “Less likely in terms of meaning is the common origin of guest and hostile, until it is remembered that strangers might be treated either as friend or enemies. Generally the less obvious identifications of meaning are well supported by the evidence of sound laws.” (Palmer, 1976).

The seventh, alternative, type of communication between the components of the CSW is determined by the means of communication “*or*”. Alternative character can be of two kinds, since the choice between objects can be made either on the basis of their identity or on the basis of their differences. Let’s compare the examples: “... It is not at all clear that the word is a clearly defined unit. ... In Arabic the definite article is written as part of the word; in English it is not. There are no clear criteria for deciding which of these is the more appropriate. Or let us compare greenhouse with White House (in the White House).” (Palmer, 1976). On the one hand, in this example, we are talking about a retro-fact and an intro-fact about non-identical objects of linguistic research (article + word and word + word), and the difference between the objects is emphasized in the meaning of the means of communication. However, on the other hand, the essence of the problem remains the same for both objects. The choice between them is based on the identity of the problem.

The following eighth form of semantic relationship between the given components is called comparative. Here, in the form of a connective part the following words are observed “*similarly*”, “*likewise*”, “*likely*”, “*equally*”, etc. Here these words are used to point to analogy of similarity of retro-fact and intro-fact. For example: “To say this is a tulip entails this is a flower, and this is scarlet entails. This is red. Similarly, there are two boys entails. There are two children.” (Palmer, 1976).

A type of semantic relationship between the components of the comparative type is the communication carried out by means of communication “*nor*”, “*neither*”. In this case, the analogy is drawn in a negative way.

The last type of semantic relationship between components is called modal-evaluative. It is installed by four groups of communication facilities:

- a) hesitantive – “*perhaps*”, “*probably*”, “*maybe*”, etc.;
- b) assertive – “*yes*”, “*certainly*”, “*indeed*”, “*of course*”, etc.
- c) negative – “*no*”;
- d) qualitative-evaluative – “*sadly*”, “*lucky*”, etc.

These groups of means of communication have a pronounced address vector, as they differ in the communicative and pragmatic nature of their semantics. The anaphoric factor is expressed in their implicit scheme of connection “*and*”, “*a*”, “*but*”, which is confirmed by the possibility of their substitution by means of communication “*and*”, “*but*”. “A so-called «safe» limit will always be regarded as a minimum rather than a maximum by those people who imagine that drinking impairs other drivers performance but not their own. Sadly, that includes most drivers.” (DBRS..., 2014).

As Gurevich notes, the modality of introductory words can be, perhaps, probably “always turns out to be controlling, so that the main composition of the sentence becomes, as it were, a dictatorial subordinate part. [...] in terms of deep semantics, a simple sentence with an introductory modal word is equivalent to a complex sentence with a modal main part [...]” (Гуревич/Gurevič, 2007).

So, the means of communication of the modal-evaluative type have a three-vector meaning and mainly perform an actual function in communication. It should be noted that the function of cohesion as a textual category is to create a logical and semantic continuum of the text. “Cohesion is a category of a logical plan, it is linear” (Хлебникова/Hlebnikova, 1983). It is natural to assume that in terms of cohesion, the category of the logical plan, the share of allied means of communication will be quite high. After all, the nature of the communication carried out by unions is to convey the “logical turn of thought” of the author of the text (Шахифович/Šahifovič, 1991).

The analysis of the linguistic material allows us to draw a number of preliminary conclusions about the specifics of the functioning of unions as formal means of cohesion in an artistic prose text. Of all the conjunctions, the most significant are the compositional conjunctions “*and*” and “*but*”, which is probably due to the fact that the connective relation is the most general, broad relation covering all syntactic “levels”. The frequency of conjunctions as linguistic means of cohesion is very low compared to their frequency at lower syntactic “levels”: phrasal and inter-phase. In the vast majority of cases, the semantics of conjunctions at the super-phrasal level does not undergo any significant changes. However, in general, it should be noted that the syntactic function of conjunctions at this level becomes more flexible, “elastic”: for example, the repetition of some conjunctions in the initial position in distantly correlated CSW contributes to the implementation of the integration category; in turn, the factor of repetition of the union in the nomination position affects the semantic “volume” of such a union, inducing one or the other of these, introducing some nuances into its semantics.

The specifics of the functioning of the allied means of cohesion in a literary text are mediated by the functional features of the style of artistic speech, in which “the aesthetic and cognitive function transforms all other functions of language” (Гальперин/Gal’perin, 1977). The nature of a literary text is such that practically any elements of the language in it can acquire stylistic labeling, that is, realize the potential to carry additional super-linear information (Одинцов/Odincov, 1980). This fully applies to allied means of cohesion. Let’s illustrate this point with two of the most illustrative examples from the works of D.H. Lawrence.

In D.H. Lawrence’s novel “The Prussian Officer”, one can note the high frequency of the connective conjunctions “and” and “but” at all syntactic “levels”. These conjunctions, “scattered” throughout the text of the novel, connect larger or smaller segments of the text that coincide with the sentence or CSW. This distribution of conjunctions contributes to the realization of the category of integration and sets a rhythm that creates the effect of slowness and monotony of narration, especially at the beginning of the novel. The somewhat slow rhythm of the novel is explained by its thematic feature: the events described by the author unfold against the background of strictly regulated, unremarkable everyday army life. However, the very fact of the “diversity” of the text segments connected by the conjunctions “and” and “but”, as well as the irregularity of their alternation (especially in the second and third parts) introduces some disruption to the rhythm of the narrative. The rhythmic glitch turns out to be not indifferent to the content of the novel. The incipient hostility between the central characters of the work, the Captain (an arrogant Prussian aristocrat) and his orderly (a simple village guy), which grows into an irresistible hatred throughout the story, is manifested, in particular, by this malfunction. By the end of the novel, the frequency of using the conjunctions “and” and “but” is gradually increasing; the segments that they connect are getting shorter. All this creates a certain “tension” in the syntax, which expresses, along with other formal means, the build-up of emotional tension in the relationship between the characters. The peculiar arrhythmic “pulsation” of the conjunctions “and” and “but” in the text of the novel prepares the denouement and thereby implements the category of prospect. In this literary text, the conjunctions “and” and “but” perform rhythmic and emotive stylistic functions.

Of great interest is an excerpt from the second part of the novel, which describes the actions and feelings of an orderly soldier who killed his commander. “Every now and then, a man harrowing on a strip of fallow shouted to his oxen, at the turn. The village and the white-towered church was small in the sunshine (CSW1). And he no longer belonged to it – he sat there, beyond, like a man outside in the dark. He had gone from everyday life into the unknown and he could not, he even did not want to go back.” (CSW2) (Lawrence, 1977).

As we can see, in this segment of the text, the compositional conjunction “and” and “but” performs syntactic communication at the phrasal, inter-phrasal and supra-phrasal levels. However, if we analyze the meaning of the union “and” and the functions it performs in this extended context, we can see the fundamental difference between “and”, which is a means of cohesion between CSW1 and CSW2.

An interesting example of the stylistic use of the compositional conjunction “but” is found in the short story *England, My England* by D.H. Lawrence. In this work, the con-

junction “*but*” is not only one of the leading linguistic means of expressing meaningful and conceptual information, but also undergoes deep semantic transformations. The story is based on the contrast of the features of the main characters, representing almost incompatible types both in terms of their social roots and temperament. The contrast, expressed by various linguistic means (of which the conjunction “*but*” plays the most active role), is like a counterpoint to the whole story. In the passage below, the role of the conjunction “*but*” in expressing the meaningful and conceptual information of the text is demonstrated, in our opinion, especially vividly. “Egbert was out it. Without anything happening, he was gradually, unconsciously excluded from the circle. His wife still loved him, physically.” (CSW1).

“But, but – he was almost the unnecessary party in the affair. He could not complain if Winifred. She still did her duty towards him. She still had a physical passion on which he had put all his life and soul.” (CSW2).

“It was a long and ever recurring but.” (CSW3).

“And then after the second child, another blonde, winsome touching, little thing, not so proud and flame-like as Joyce – after Annabel came, then Egbert began truly to realize how it was.” (CSW4).

“His wife still loved him. But – and now the but had grown enormous – her physical love for him was of secondary importance to her. After all she had had it, this physical passion, for two years now. It was not this, that one lived from. No, no – something sterner, realer.” (CSW5).

“She began to resent her own passion for Egbert – just a little she began to despise it. For after all there he was, he was charming, he was lovable, he was terribly desirable.” (CSW6).

“But – but – oh, the awful looming loud of that but: – he did not stand firm in the landscape of her life like a tower of strength, like a pillar of significance...” (CSW7) (Lawrence, 1977).

In the first four CSWs, the conjunction “*but*”, repeated many times in the nomination position, constructively belongs to Egbert’s speech party. Accumulating these oppositions, the conjunction “*but*” gradually acquires a self-sufficient meaning: it loses the grammatical status of a service word and undergoes a process of substantiation (a long while and ever recurring but in CSW3). Since CSW5, the union “*but*” has been part of the speech party of Egbert’s wife Winifred, fulfilling the function of implementing the integration category. At the same time, the “*but*” alliance helps to identify meaningful and conceptual information not only in this section of the text, but also in the story as a whole: family drama is inevitable, because Egbert and Winifred’s socio-historical roots (social origin, upbringing, cultural traditions, etc.), differing to the point of incompatibility, are stronger than physical love. The subsequent events in the story seem to illustrate the deepening discord in Egbert and Winifred’s family, in which “centrifugal” forces prevail over family attachment to the hearth and children. Special mention should be made of the role of other formal means, which in this case play a subordinate role compared to the “*but*” union. These are graphic means of expression: “but, – but” in CSW2 and CSW3, where it signals a vague premonition of trouble (loss of love, understanding between spouses), which has

not yet turned into confidence; in CSW3 and CSW7, the conjunction “*but*”, which has undergone substantiation, is italicized, which further enhances its stylistic labeling. The lexical means of expression include epithets: “a long while and ever recurring” to the substantive “*but*”, signalling that a vague sense of trouble and alienation between spouses has become quite familiar.; the metaphorical epithet in the last CSW (the awful looming cloud of that but!) expresses not only the heroine’s subjective and evaluative attitude to the disorder in her family, but also indicates a kind of informative “progression” in the semantics of the union “*but*”, which in this text, being the leading means of implementing intra-textual connections, acquires a special, a textual meaning that gives it an almost symbolic significance on the scale of the entire work.

Conclusion

As the analysis of examples shows, even at the super-phrasal (super-segmental) level, allied means of cohesion can acquire stylistic labelling. This primarily applies to the compositional conjunctions “*and*” and “*but*”. The aesthetic and cognitive function of a literary text allows these unions, along with some other linguistic means (primarily lexical), to realize the conjugation of certain text categories, in particular the categories of integration, informative content of conceptual information and prospectus.

Special textual consistency can transform the usual functions of conjunctions as service words, as well as make changes in their semantics. In an artistic prose text, conjunctions can perform a number of stylistic functions, such as emotive, rhythmic, and expressive-excretory. A close interaction is established between the function of the union in the text and its meaning. On the one hand, the categorical meanings of conjunctions as grammatical means of communication determine their functions in the text. On the other hand, the functions performed by conjunctions in a particular speech work, in turn, affect their semantics: they identify, recreate, form and generate shades of meaning or even new meanings.

References

- Abdullayev Ə.Ə. (1998), *Aktual üzvlənmə və mətn*, Bakı: Xəzər Universitetinin Nəşriyyatı.
- Brown G. (1977), *Listening to Spoken English*, London: Longman Publishing.
- DBRS Finalizes Provisional Ratings on WFRBS Commercial Mortgage Trust 2014-C25 (2014), “Morning Star”, 12 December.
- Halliday M.A.K. (1976), *Cohesion in English*, “English Lang.”, Ser. 9 M.A.K. Halliday, R. Hasan, London: Longman.
- Lawrence D.H. (1915), *England, My England*, London: Penguin Books.
- Lawrence D.H. (1977), *The Prussian Officer*, London: Penguin.
- Palmer F.P. (1976), *Semantics. A New Outline*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker G. (1978), *The Darkness of the Morning*, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Абдуллаев К.М. (1983), *Актуальное членение предложения в азербайджанском языке*, “Советская тюркология”, № 1, с. 61–75 / Abdullaev, K.M. (1983), *Aktual'noe členenie predloženiâ v azerbajdžanskom âzyke*, “Sovetskaâ tûrkologiâ”, № 1, s. 61–75.

Блох М.Я. (1983), *Теоретическая грамматика английского языка: Учебник для студентов филологических факультетов университетов и факультетов английского языка педагогических вузов*, Москва: Высшая школа / Blokh M.Â. (1983), *Teoretičeskaâ grammatika angliïskogo âzyka: Učebnik dlâ studentov filologičeskih fakul'tetov universitetov i fakul'tetov angliïskogo âzyka pedagogičeskih vuzov*, Moskva: Vyssaâ škola.

Виноградов В.В. (1963), *Стилистика: Теория поэтической речи*, Москва: АН СССР / Vinogradov V.V. (1963), *Stilistika: Teoriâ poëtičeskoï reči*, Moskva: AN SSSR.

Гальперин И.Р. (1977), *К проблеме зависимости предложения от контекста*, “Вопросы языкознания”, № 1, с. 48–55 / Gal'perin I.R. (1977), *K probleme zavisimosti predloženiâ ot konteksta*, “Voprosy âzykoznanîâ”, № 1, s. 48–55.

Гальперин И.Р. (1981), *Текст как объект лингвистического исследования*, Москва: Наука / Gal'perin I.R. (1981), *Tekst kak ob"ekt lingvističeskogo issledovaniâ*, Moskva: Nauka.

Гуревич В.В. (2007), *Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков: Учебное пособие*, Москва: Флинта, Наука / Gurevič V.V. (2007), *Teoretičeskaâ grammatika angliïskogo âzyka. Sraznittel'naâ tipologiâ angliïskogo i russkogo âzykov: Učebnoe posobie*, Moskva: Flinta, Nauka.

Ильиш Б.А. (1971), *Строй современного английского языка. Учебник по курсу теоретической грамматики для студентов педвузов*, Ленинград: Просвещение / Il'iš B.A. (1971), *Stroj sovremennogo angliïskogo âzyka. Učebnik po kursu teoretičeskoï grammatiki dlja studentov pedvuzov*, Leningrad: Prosvešenie.

Кручинина Л.И. (1982), *Основные средства когезии английского научного текста*, Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук., Москва / Kruchinina L.I. (1982), *Osnovnye sredstva kogezi angliïskogo nauchnogo teksta: Avtoreferat dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. [Author's abstract of PhD dissertation (Philological Sciences)]*, Moskva.

Кухаренко В.А. (1988), *Интерпретация текста*, Москва: Просвещение / Kuharenko V.A. (1988), *Interpretaciâ teksta*, Moskva: Prosvešenie.

Николаева Т.М. (1987), *Единицы текста и теория текста*, “Исследования по структуре текста”, с. 27–57 / Nikolaeva T.M. (1987), *Edinicy teksta i teoriâ teksta*, “Issledovaniâ po strukture teksta”, s. 27–57.

Николаева Т.М. (2012), *О чем рассказывают нам тексты?*, Москва: Языки славянских культур / Nikolaeva T.M. (2012), *O čem rasskazyvajut nam teksty?*, Moskva: Âzyki slavânskikh kul'tur.

Ноздрина Л.А. (1981), *Композиция и грамматические средства связности художественного текста: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук.*, Москва / Nozdrina L.A. (1981), *Kompoziciâ i grammatičeskie sredstva svâznosti hudožestvennogo teksta: Avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk.*, Moskva.

Одинцов В.В. (1980), *Стилистика текста*, Москва: Наука / Odincov V.V. (1980), *Stilistika teksta*, Moskva: Nauka.

Потебня А.А. (1958), *Из записок по русской грамматике. Т. I–II*. Москва: Учпедгиз / Potebnâ A.A. (1958), *Iz zapisok po russkoï grammatike. T. I–II*, Moskva: Učpedgiz.

Тураева З.Я. (1986), *Лингвистика текста*, Москва: Просвещение / Turaeva Z.Â. (1986), *Lingvistika teksta*, Moskva: Prosvešenie.

Хлебникова И.Б. (1983), *К проблеме средств связи между предложениями в тексте (на материале английского языка)*, “Иностранные языки в школе”, № 1, с. 6–11 / Hlebnikova I.B. (1983), *K probleme sredstv svâzi meždû predloženíjami v tekste (na materiale angliiskogo âzyka)*, “Inostrannye âzyki v škole”, № 1, s. 6–11.

Черняховская Л.А. (1983), *Смысловая структура текста и ее единицы*, “Вопросы языкознания”, № 6, с. 114–123 / Černâhovskaâ L.A. (1983), *Smyslovaâ struktura teksta i ee edinicy*, “Voprosy âzykoznanîâ”, № 6, s. 114–123.

Шахифович А.М., Габ М.А. (1991), *Прагматика текста: психолингвистический подход*, [в:] Красных В.В. (отв. ред.), *Текст как единица коммуникации. Сборник научных трудов*, вып. 371, Москва: МГЛУ, с. 103–112 / Šahifovič A.M., Gab M.A. (1991), *Pragmatika teksta: psiholingvističeskij podhod*, [v:] Krasnyh V.V. (otv. red.), *Tekst kak ediniça kommunikacii. Sbornik naučnyh trudov*, vyp. 371, Moskva: MGLU, s. 103–112.

