Studies in Text and Discourse

Studies in Text and Discourse

By

Azad Mammadov

Studies in Text and Discourse

By Azad Mammadov

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

To my beloved parents
Yahya Mammadov and Julyetta Mammadova

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The main goal of this textbook is to introduce to MA students of linguistics and English language teacher education programmes the foundations and advanced topics in the studies of text and discourse and shed light on their role in verbal communication. Such a general issue in text and discourse studies as the approach to this unique social interaction from the perspectives of pragmatics and cognition is also in focus, as the textbook plans to provide knowledge about contemporary text and discourse theories.

Despite the numerous textbooks in this field, I have decided to revisit this topic due to the recent researches in discourse that have reshaped our understanding of its role not only in linguistics but also in humanities and social sciences. There is a general consensus that the study of text and discourse at universities (graduate programmes) is a matter of necessity rather than prestige in most countries of the world due to the growing demand in the studies of verbal communication in general. This is why it is very hard to identify any specific university, country, or region that this textbook will most appeal to.

There are some popular textbooks (Brown and Yule 1998; Johnstone 2007; Coulthard 2007; Widdowson 2007) that cover a broad range of issues in the studies of text and discourse. The difference with my textbook is that it provides a more introductory tool by offering a theoretical framework and hands-on practical experience. The demand for this has come mainly from those for whom a conscious awareness of language is an integral part of being university students, lecturers, and researchers, upon whom the influence of the studies of text and discourse has also been making itself increasingly felt in linguistics in recent years.

Since linguistics treats language as a social and psychological phenomenon, and, in general terms, not merely as a means of communication but also as a symbol of cultural identity, the theoretical and practical aspects of the study of language gain momentum. It's clear that one can't be a specialist or have language proficiency and a competence to teach modern language without in-depth linguistic knowledge. So, in order to educate future linguists in general and teachers of TEFL in particular, a comprehensive teaching of different branches of linguistics, including text and discourse studies, becomes a serious challenge.

It should be taken into consideration that linguistics has a long and contradictory tradition in the interpretation of text and discourse. For a certain period of time, the term "discourse" was used in English-speaking linguistics (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Warner 1980), whereas "text" was preferred in the German-speaking and other continental linguistic traditions (Dressler 1970; Galperin 1981). This period was characterized by the intense use of both terms in order to identify the unit of grammar beyond sentence. The provisions of its identification as discourse and text were also given in the relevant researches, among which one is the most important: text or discourse should be a formally and semantically connected whole. The semantic connectedness is necessary for the use of text in the process of human interaction, i.e. to realize certain pragmatic intentions in the text. On the other hand, text can exist in isolation from the outside world, and ancient written monuments are good examples of that. But, of course, this is a rare case. Text should contain a pragmatic effect and be socially motivated. Such an approach has been the leading one since the 1980s, and introduced a new stage in the relationship between text and discourse. In this regard, we are interested in the linguistic (De Beaugrande and Dressler 1980), sociolinguistic (Fairclough 1995), and sociocognitive (van Dijk 2008) approaches to text and discourse studies. These issues have been extensively under focus for the last three decades.

The structure of this book is therefore designed to meet this challenge. It is divided into four units. The first unit offers basic knowledge about the key theoretical issues and concepts in the studies of text and discourse. It covers the history of the topic and major approaches to text as a linguistic phenomenon. The second concentrates on the transition process from text linguistics to discourse analysis, highlighting the issues related to the pragmatics of text and discourse. The third outlines the main concepts in the study of discourse from the perspectives of its role in society, focusing attention on the sociolinguistic (including the issue of type and genre classification) and sociocognitive approaches to discourse studies. Finally, the fourth unit discusses the ways that discourse helps to reveal various linguistic and metaphoric representations across languages and genres. Each unit also contains sections that include learning goals and expectations, visual aid and data for analysis, and some questions for further study. The list of references, the author and subject indices, and multiple choice tests are at the end of the textbook.

In preparing the book, I have tried to present a brief survey of most of these issues and problems in a reader-friendly manner. It is therefore designed as a kind of reference work for those students and researchers who are interested in this topic. The demand has come mainly from those for whom a conscious awareness of language is an integral part of the exercise of the profession, and upon whom the influence of the studies of text and discourse has been making itself increasingly felt in recent years. This characterization includes two main groups: the range of linguistics and the range of teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL).

This textbook underlines the significance and application of the study of text and discourse with a view to shaping student's perceptions and understanding of the sociological, political, economic, and cultural contexts during verbal communication. Thus, it will enable students to understand better the nature of verbal communication and how text and discourse studies can help learners to become effective communicators through understanding their role in social life.

xii Preface

This textbook is expected to help students to develop their skills in using theoretical literature to analyse and comment on linguistic theories and hypotheses, to apply theoretical knowledge to practical activities, to analyse empirical material using appropriate linguistic methods, as well as to promote their creative and critical thinking.

I hope to expand it for a second edition, and I would welcome suggestions, recommendations, and critical comments and views on its improvement.

Azad Mammadov
Azerbaijan University of Languages, Baku
August 2017

UNIT I

TEXT AND DISCOURSE IN THE CONTEXT OF LINGUISTIC STUDIES

Learning Goals and Outcome

This unit aims to introduce to students the foundations and advanced topics in the history of text and discourse studies, which have come to play an important role in linguistics, partly because they represent intrinsic subject matter and partly because they are a response to the limitations and over-idealizations dominating other linguistic theories.

The unit will enable students to demonstrate knowledge in the scientific developments of text and discourse studies and contemporary text grammar theories and their links to other fields in text linguistics, and to critically interpret the text under analysis in terms of functional style, lexical and grammatical peculiarities, and sentence structures using subject-related concepts.

Content and Themes

1.1. History

In the late twentieth century, numerous studies were conducted by Michel Foucault, Michael Halliday, Teun A. van Dijk, Robert de Beaugrande, Ernesto Laclau, Chantal Mouffe, Wallace Chafe, Norman Fairclough, and other researchers on text and discourse, their nature and relations to the individual, knowledge, and society, and their social, semiotic, pragmatic, and cognitive aspects. In fact, by considering discourse as an object of

study, those philosophers, semioticians, linguists, and sociologists fulfilled a very important mission: they managed to secure the future development of certain crucial aspects of each of these disciplines, sometimes even leading to their survival, and ultimately laying out the foundation of two new disciplines (discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis or critical discourse studies). It should be noted that there is a terminological difference between critical discourse analysis and critical discourse studies, as is highlighted by van Dijk (2016, 63):

> This chapter introduces the sociocognitive approach in Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) more traditionally called critical discourse analysis (CDA). I avoid the term CDA because it suggests that it is a method of discourse analysis, and not a critical perspective or attitude in the field of discourse studies (DS) using many different methods of humanities and social sciences.

We can divide the history of the views and studies on text and discourse into two formal periods: the first period starts with the introduction of the langue vs. parole dichotomy by De Saussure (2000, 141) and ends with the views of Foucault on the relationship between knowledge and discourse (Foucault, 1972); the second period, starting with Foucault, is still underway. The first period is characterized by researches of the French-speaking followers of De Saussure, as well as works in the English-speaking linguistic tradition (Harris 1952). In general, "discourse" and "parole" were used in the French-speaking structuralist tradition (Benveniste 1954, Barthes 1970, etc.) to identify speech.

Meanwhile, the approach to discourse in the English-speaking tradition was quite different, as "discourse" was mostly used along with "text" to identify a stretch of language larger than a sentence (Harris 1952). This trend in the English-speaking linguistic tradition lasted until the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Despite the differences in views regarding the role and importance of text in discourse studies, not only linguists but also some philosophers and psychologists consider text (from semiotic perspectives) as an important element of discourse. (Barthes 1970). In text linguistics, a certain element of confusion was clarified by Enkvist (1989, 372): "discourse means text + context, where context contains a situational component."

Thus, we can come to such simplistic conclusion that there is no discourse without text and context. Despite the obvious difficulties in identifying a clear difference between text and discourse (it sometimes causes the synthesis of text linguistics and the grammar of text with discourse analysis), the abovementioned definition helps to understand the difference. Text is a final product or final result, whereas discourse is a process of text construction. As we can see, text can be studied as the real product of certain activity, while discourse is more complex. If we want to study it we have to reveal the idea and intention of the sender, that is to say it is necessary to define presuppositions hidden behind the explicit linguistic form.

This trend of the treatment of text and discourse as two different phenomena has thus gained momentum in text linguistics and discourse studies. Any discourse implies the existence of text (linguistic or belonging to different semiotic systems), whereas not all texts (for example, ancient texts) can be treated as discourse.

The abovementioned issue of the terminological differences between text and discourse caused the emergence of another serious problem that requires an explicit answer to the following question: what is the difference between text linguistics and discourse analysis?

Even within the brief history of text linguistics we can be wary of simplistic definitions of successful textual functions or textual well-formedness. Where some early studies in text linguistics (Dressler 1970) set up discrete binary distinctions between well-formed and ill-formed texts taking over one of the most crucial issues in generative linguistics (Chomsky 1957), which was the dominating school of linguistics in this

period, many linguists later tried to discuss text in a more pluralistic frame. First of all, linguists have made attempts to define the place of text in the syntactic system. Sentence was considered as the basic element of text within functional sentence perspective studies (Halliday 1967). Meanwhile, it also deals with text strategies in terms of the distribution of information and the role of each text component being evaluated for its semantic contribution to the whole text. The notion of "communicative dynamism" has been introduced as an attempt to classify the different levels of contribution within a text, particularly with reference to theme and rheme. Halliday's main principle includes the full supremacy of text over sentence during the analysis of the properties of language as well as its use. He even distinguishes the textual function of language among its metafunctions, which implies the sender's (speaker or writer) ability to construct a text.

In fact, when we use language to link other stretches of language or help our ideas "come together," we perform the textual function. Halliday emphasizes that the "functional sentence perspective" plays a major role in the actualization of the textual functions of language and is key in the construction of a sentence as an instrument to convey information.

The dominance of the sender's role in the functional sentence perspective conditions its definition as the linguistic device for the organization of a text (Halliday 1971). Enkvist suggests making a terminological distinction between text linguistics and inter-phrasal linguistics (although he admits some coincidence in this regard) (Enkvist 1973, 111). He characterizes the first one as the field of study dealing with texts and the second as the field of study dealing with those properties of a sentence requiring a reference beyond the sentence. Such an approach to the grammar of the supra-phrase units has brought about a common understanding that traditional grammar should go beyond sentence and cover the issues related to the connecting or linking sentences within text.

As the categories of text cover the issues beyond clause and sentence, the structure of text, text connexity, the functional perspective of text, the distribution of information in text, and the pragmatics of text emerged as

the most important issues for exploration in the 1970s and 1980s. In this period, the researchers focused mainly on the approach that considered text as the product of speech. Under this approach, the term "text" was used in two ways: (1) to identify a stretch of language consisting of one or more sentences reflecting the sender's intention; (2) to identify a story, a novel, an article, or a similar product of speech. But the common view was that text is a specific structure of connected meaningful and internally organized units. There are linguistic and logical factors ensuring the internal and external wholeness of text. Lexical repetitions, formal grammatical elements (conjunctions, particles, articles, pronouns, etc.), and the development of ideas (theme, rheme) are among the most important linguistic factors.

Traditionally, text is considered in two ways: propositionally and communicatively. The first approach is based on the view that any (written) text minimally consists of two sentences, linked through different explicit devices. It implies the application of those features that have already been defined for sentence analysis (the name of the approach originating from that) to the study of text. Of course, such an exploration might have positive results. In order to ensure the solid linguistic status of text, as well as focus on the linguistic nature of many textual issues, text requires a sentence-based approach. The second approach is functional, which implies the study of a text as well as the distinction of its immanent features without using the homogenous syntactic structures. Such an approach conditions strict differentiation of the specific features of text as a whole. According to the second approach, a sender constitutes a communicative unit of some specific and definable type in the process of communication.

These two research aspects might be considered as two approaches that complement each other. They are included in the research of the invariant text type or textema in terms of finding out the common rules of text organization, as well as of the "actualization" of textema, that is to say the focus of the studies was on the identification of a stretch of speech as text

of different types: literary, media, or scientific. Concurrently, there were discussions about the principles and criteria used to define text and the possibilities to distinguish models and types of text.

When we consider the linguistic units from the communicative angle, the pragmatic and cognitive factors dominate other factors. It is due to the simple fact that language as a whole and all its elements fulfil an important social task to ensure communication among the members of social groups by the exchange of information through the conventional signs.

In modern functionalism, it has come to be applied to the study of language from the point of view of the participants of the communication process, especially in the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the mutual effects the participants have during communication. The field focuses on an area between pragmatics, semantics, sociolinguistics, and extra-linguistic context, including the aspects of text linguistics and discourse analysis.

All these issues have been under focus for the last two decades within discourse analysis (Coulthard 2007; Widdowson 2007), critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 1995; Teubert 2010), and the sociocognitive approach to discourse (van Dijk 2008; 2009; 2014). Hence, discourse as an object of intertextual study represents a special interest to linguists, philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, and other researchers in humanities and the social sciences.

1.2. From sentence grammar to text grammar

Structural analysis, as one type of the descriptive approach, has traditionally been used to study the linguistic units in a hierarchy (Harris 1951). This analysis has made a great contribution at all levels, including that of syntax. According to Enkvist, "Syntax is by nature hierarchic. In sentence we cannot say or write two things at the same time. The sentences have to be presented one after the other, in linear order. Therefore the problem is how to signal hierarchies through linear presentation" (Enkvist 1989, 370). One such attempt was made by the

representatives of the Prague School of Linguistics (Vachek 1970, Firbas 1972). The Praguean influence has been widespread and long-lasting. Its main emphasis lay on the analysis of language as a system of functionally related units. The notion "unit" recalls in some way the Saussurean influence (De Saussure 2000). In particular, it led to the distinction between the phonetic and phonological analysis of sounds, the analysis of the phoneme as having distinctive features, and the theme-rheme or communicative structure of the sentence.

There has been much work on the theme-rheme or communicative structure of the sentence. Here one major point is that this phenomenon directly indicates that languages are designed not just as abstract systems, but as tools for human communication, a point of view underlined in the functional approaches to language structure. This notion has led to a new stage in the Prague School studies with reference to the stylistics, semantics, and pragmatics of the English and Slavic languages. The most important issue here is the formulation of a theory of the functional sentence perspective, which considers sentence analysis as a complex of functionally contrastive constituents. It also deals with text strategies in terms of the distribution of information in it and of the role of each text component being evaluated for its semantic contribution to the whole text. The notion of "communicative dynamism" was introduced as an attempt to classify the different levels of contribution within a text, particularly with reference to theme and rheme.

The functional sentence perspective examines the arrangement of the elements of a sentence in the light of its linguistic and extra-linguistic (situational, social, and cultural) contexts. What is known, or may be inferred, or is the starting point of a communication (the communicative basis), is to be regarded as the theme of a clause. The theme is used in linguistics as part of an analysis of the communicative structure of a sentence. It refers, not to the subject matter of a sentence, but to the way the sender identifies the relative importance of their subject matter, and is defined as the first major constituent of a clause. The elements that convey

the new or important piece of information (the communicative nucleus) constitute the rheme.

In the Prague School approach to linguistics, the rheme is distinguished from the theme. The rheme is defined as the part of a sentence that adds most to the advancing process of communication (it has the highest degree of communicative dynamism). It expresses the largest amount of extra meaning in addition to what has already been communicated. But the theme carries the lowest degree of communicative dynamism. As we can see, the theme is opposed to the rheme.

The elements that belong to neither theme nor rheme in a clause are transitional. In general, the thematic elements are communicatively less dynamic, and therefore carry a smaller amount of communicative dynamism than the rhematic elements.

As alternative terms, new and old or given information, topic and comments, focus and presupposition, as well as background and foreground are also used (Givon 1990; Tomlin 1995). Prague School linguists identify sentences as being ordered on the basis of theme and rheme, but do not distinguish theme from given (old) or new information.

The further analysis of the communicative structure is complex and controversial: a common next step is to distinguish between old (given) and new information. Researchers who use this approach usually distinguish between information structure and grammatical structure (Halliday 1967; Chafe 1971). Of course, this varies from language to language. For example, in the English sentence one normally proceeds from the known to the unknown: one begins with the rheme and therefore the new elements with the highest degree of communicative dynamism come last in a sentence. Chafe wrote about this phenomenon, emphasizing the communicative role of the predicate in sentences like "Box is empty." Here, "box" is regarded as the theme and "empty" is the rheme (Chafe 1971, 275).

This was developed with a new approach in systemic functional linguistics (SFG) through the contrast of new and old or given, and theme

and rheme. Bloor and Bloor suggest that there are in fact two structures that operate at the level of the clause that should be clearly differentiated (Bloor and Bloor 2004, 65):

> In SFG, we recognize two parallel and interrelated systems of analysis that concern the structure of the clause with regard to organizing the message. The first of these is called information structure and involves constituents that are labeled Given and New. The second is called thematic structure and involves constituents that are labeled Theme and Rheme.

Bloor and Bloor also differentiated between spoken and written language (2004, 79–80):

> In spoken English, we can use special emphasis and intonation to indicate that we are presenting New information in the Theme position instead of the more normal Rheme position. We can make a contrast, for example, between The kettle's boiling, which has New at the end, and The kettle's boiling (not the milk) which has New in the initial position.

> In written English prose, however, it is more difficult to vary the relationship of Theme and Rheme to Given and New respectively.

Every language has not only various phonetic (prosodic), but also grammatical, lexical, stylistic, and punctuation (italics or inverted commas) devices for highlighting new and important information. The structure we impose during the process of communication is something that is built into the grammar of the language and happens at the level of the clause and the sentence. All clauses and sentences have structures, and we make use of these in spoken as well as written language.

The rheme in English is often signalled by the indefinite article, particles, time adverbs, determiners, and words like "one" or "some." The theme is signalled by the definite article, personal and demonstrative pronouns, and a determiner. Another important signal of the rheme in English is word order. As word order is relatively fixed, for example, in English it can stylistically distinguish rheme, thus imposing pragmatic

communicative dynamism. In fact, every language has various grammatical devices for certain communicative strategies. Thus, the theme and the rheme can be marked in a sentence by particles, definite and indefinite articles, personal and demonstrative pronouns, time adverbs, and word order. The use of all these grammatical elements and phenomena is motivated by the pragmatic intentions of a sender.

Various particles can indicate the importance of any part of a sentence, thus imposing communicative dynamism (Konig 1991). The rheme is mentioned by *only* and *also* stressing additional communicative value in these sentences (see examples 1 and 2). When the sender forms a sentence, they think about what kind of information to supply first and how to do it. Chafe (1971) suggests that for a normal English sentence theme comes first, but if new or important information should be focused on then the abovementioned rheme signals are commonly used.

The indefinite article helps to identify an object or an event as a new one with a high degree of functional contribution (see example 3). The same role is played by the indefinite determiner *some* (see example 4). The element *one* has a similar function (see example 5). Some linguists (Quirk et al. 1985) believe that time adverbs like *now* also deliver new information in a sentence (see example 6), which is shown more clearly in advertisements (see example 7). As we csn see, the time adverb *now* helps the receiver to focus attention on the fact of introducing a new stage in the flow of thought.

Another important linguistic device to mark something new or important is the word order in a sentence. Traditionally, it is believed that every language has its own mental and unmarked word order, and many linguists have written about specific word order for every language (Greenberg 1963; Mithun 1992). It is a well-known fact that the subject-verb-complement order in an English sentence is relatively fixed or strict. However, the Prague School tradition insists on the pragmatic motivation of word order, which can easily be changed in Slavic languages like Russian by the sender's intention. In other words, the normal theme-rheme

or subject-verb-complement structure is only a basis for possible communicative changes. It is also the case for the English sentence, where the last word of the sentence is the rheme's natural position and therefore the communicative dynamism lies on it (see example 8).

Any unusual change in word order has a pragmatic effect and signals that emphasis has been switched to another part of the sentence. In the normal theme-rheme or subject-verb-complement sentence, the communicative dynamism will be on the complement or the last word (see example 9).

If, however, any component of a sentence is "abnormally" put at the head of a sentence, that component will carry a heavy communicative dynamism as part of the rheme, engulfing the theme (see examples 10 and 11). The way in which elements within a sentence are ordered can give weighting to one or more aspects and reduce, or remove, others (e.g. "for the past fifty years" and "came the boldest move").

It should be stressed that particles, articles, adverbs, inversions, and other abovementioned grammatical elements and phenomena not only mark something important or may even be considered as deviations, but also fulfil the task of the text connexity markers (Weinrich 1971; Klammer, Schulz, and Volpe 2007).

The aspects of syntax that were discussed in some detail here related to relationships that exist between elements in a clause. The relationship between elements has a fundamental role in a sentence and, in fact, creates communicative dynamism. The communicative dynamism indicates the importance of correctly preserving emphasis in a sentence. There is always at least an argument for retaining a theme-rheme or rheme-theme order through sacrificing syntax and even lexis. In general terms, syntax is an important factor in the way text creates meaning.

1.3. Text and its definitions (structural and communicative)

A number of linguists have attempted to define the place of text in the syntactic system. Danes (1966) distinguished the level of text as being

separate within syntax (alongside phrases and sentences). Halliday's main principle includes the full supremacy of text over sentence during the analysis of the properties of language as well as its use. He even distinguishes the textual function of language among its metafunctions, which implies the speaker's or writer's ability to organize a text. In fact, when we use language to link other stretches of language or help our ideas "come together," we perform the textual function. Halliday emphasized that the "functional sentence perspective" plays a major role in the actualization of the textual functions of language and is key in the construction of the sentence as an instrument to convey information. The dominance of the sender's role in the functional sentence perspective conditions its definition as the linguistic device for text construction (Halliday 1971). Enkvist (1973, 111) suggested making a terminological distinction between text linguistics and inter-phrasal linguistics (although he admits some coincidence in this regard). He characterized the first as the science dealing with texts and the second as the science dealing with those properties of the sentence requiring a reference beyond the sentence. Such an approach to the grammar of the supra-phrase units has made it apparent that the traditional grammar should go beyond the sentence and cover the issues related to the linking sentences within text.

However, as texts consist of sentences, their units and structures can be used to construct texts. For example, Enkvist writes that "the information structure (theme-rheme or topic-comment structure) of the clause and sentence are exponents of text strategies governing text connexity" (1989, 379). In sentence grammar, the structure of the sentence is demonstrated in analysing the parts of a so-called declarative sentence. Grammarians traditionally analyse it in this way because this type of sentence is employed for making statements in discourse and it exceeds the other types (interrogative, exclamatory, imperative) in frequency of use.

In the event of our recognition of the declarative sentence as a normal and typical sentence, or, in other words, as an invariant or neutral type, then we may assume that an invariant or neutral type of text can also be

found in the area of statements. And if we accept that frequency as a criterion, we can find typical texts in media, fiction, everyday conversations, etc. Moreover, there is another issue regarding the difference between planned vs. unplanned texts that correlates with the difference between written and spoken texts. Therefore, another important issue that has traditionally caused discussions was whether text can be written or spoken, given the fact that the prosodic elements are usually considered as the integral parts of text. From this perspective, the definition of text given by Halliday and Hasan is quite interesting (1976, 56): "The word text is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole."

Rudolph has a similar approach (1989, 53):

> a written or spoken utterance or a sequence of utterances for which the following formal characteristics can be formulated. In written language, a text is constituted as a whole by optical means such as a heading, a new page or free space separating it from other texts. In spoken language a text is to be found between pauses or between utterances performed by other persons.

It is clear that if we approach a literary work or newspaper as a text or its fragment then the prosodic elements can't function as the integral parts of text structure. The consideration of the issues related to prosody focuses attention on the manifestation of a code and the organization of text. Under such view, spoken or written texts become the variants of that manifestation and text is considered as the fragment of speech activity.

We also have to note that the study of the prosodic factors in text linguistics as the distinctive elements of text can be explained by the attempts to apply structural-semantic analysis to the study of syntactic relations. This is very obvious in the studies of the theme-rheme structure of text. Both sentence and text can vary depending on intonation. The theme-rheme alternation of accents changes not only the proportion between the integral parts of the semantics of text but also the integral

parts themselves. It is clear that this important factor can be actualized only in spoken text. As a device of text construction, prosody became important when the communicative perspectives gained momentum in the studies of text.

Thus, a growing number of linguists have started to consider text boundaries as being quite variable, extending from one utterance up to works of several volumes. The analysis of the investigations in this aspect suggests that the approaches to the nature of the structural criterion of text are quite disputable. On the other hand, text is regarded as the unit beyond or above sentence and rather different in its features, while on the other hand the structure of text is defined as a whole of the connected sentences.

If text is considered as a unit with a specific structure, then, first of all, its nature and difference from the structure of sentence should be distinguished. Otherwise, we will have not a real text but a flow of connected speech through various formal linguistic devices. It is obvious that each linguistic category has its own sphere of use. The definition of the units of the linguistic categories belonging to the "lower level" of the hierarchy is rather simpler than the definition of the "upper level" units of the hierarchy.

But what is the structural criterion for defining text? Some researchers indicate the linear nature of a text, defining it as a linear sequence of linked sentences via various connectors in line with certain rules (Weinrich 1971; Halliday and Hasan 1976). Cohesion, which is regarded as a formal means of unity of text, is manifested thanks to a number of factors. In fact, each level of the structure of language makes a contribution to the cohesion in text. From this perspective, the definition of text given by Weinrich is quite interesting (1971, 225): "Text as the ordered succession of minimum two and maximum infinite morphemes is the constant alternation of lexical and functional morphemes."

It is necessary to identify two common sets of connections: one is the connection of a linear sequence between the components of text, and the second is the connection of multiple references between the components of text, i.e. the existence of explicit or implicit repetitions within the structure

of text. Other linguists stress that text seems to be a linear sequence only covertly, but is actually a multidimensional phenomenon (Enkvist 1989). They believed that the definition of text as a sequence of linked sentences is not sufficient. Despite mentioning all relevant features of the text structure during the description of the various links between the fragments of text, some necessary prerequisites for defining a string of sentences as a meaningful sequence or text are not clear. Such a demand for a comprehensive study neglects views about the linear nature of text and concludes that a text is a very complex multidimensional whole composed of mutually connected factors and elements.

The studies show that text includes some fragments with a range of structural features. In fact, the study of the sentence based on its parts can be formally applied to text analysis as well. However, we can't define the functional-stylistic and compositional features of text or its stylistic and pragmatic settings by analysing a single sentence because its structure and its features do not reveal the specifics of a text in various functional styles as well as the strategies of the uses of various linguistic devices within a text. Despite these difficulties with defining text (such as one word, one sentence, two sentences, or a big novel), there is a general understanding that the most important issue is whether it communicates or not regardless of its size.

The basic structure of an invariant text is simple. It is composed of three sections: beginning or introduction, main part, and the end. This is similar to school or university devices for essay writing or other academic writing. These three parts in written texts are normally planned and elaborated in detail, while they are also typical for unplanned spontaneous texts.

The following scheme of the structure of text is widely accepted:

(1) Theme
(2) Main part
(3) Conclusion

The theme is usually given in the first sentence of the text, if it is not mentioned in a headline. It may be followed by some arguments or descriptions varying it or showing the general context.

The main part is the elaboration of the theme and this can have a number of subdivisions. The only factor that ensures their coexistence is the theme.

The conclusion does not necessarily offer results but merely has to make clear that the end is near.

The following article from *The Guardian* clearly illustrates this classic structure (see example 12). The author constructed this newspaper text based on the abovementioned structure. The headline "Why vaping is a disaster for smokers?" ideally reflects the theme *vaping* and *e-cigarettes*, which is introduced in the first sentence and then developed in the main body of the text. The concluding remarks do not include the result but rather raise new questions about the future of *electronic or otherwise "traditional" smoking*. In addition, various lexical (*zone-zone*, *e-cigarette-e-cigarette*, etc.) and grammatical (*the zone*, *but, and*, etc.) cohesive devices were also used by the author to construct this text.

Texts form cohesive and coherent units of language that are constructed to operate in units larger than the single sentence or clause. To speak about cohesion and coherence, we should know where the border between micro-units and macro-units of texts runs. There is a case for arguing that every device signalling the cohesion and coherence of text defines its own text unit and paragraph. Enkvist (1989, 380) suggests that "a paragraph might consist of a topic sentence, a support sentence supporting the topic sentence, a support sentence supporting the first support sentence, and so forth. As long as such a hierarchy can be interpreted as supporting one single sentence (the topic sentence), the paragraph can be said to constitute one text unit."

It should also be taken into consideration that Halliday and Hasan identify the textual component of the grammar of English as consisting of the features associated with two groups of resources: the structural and the

cohesive. The first is subdivided into the two areas: information structure and theme-rheme structure. The second is subdivided into four areas: reference, ellipsis and substitution, conjunction, and lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan 1976). The term "reference," as used by Halliday and Hasan, is an extension of the term as used in philosophy and some types of semantics to mean an act of referring to entities outside the text but within the discourse. Reference in this sense is not necessarily textually cohesive.

A characteristic of cohesive reference is that, on second and subsequent mention, instead of being named, the person or thing referred to may be indicated by means of the personal or demonstrative pronouns *he*, *she*, *this*, *these*, etc. The repetition of nominal may also have a cohesive function, but there is a special characteristic that is produced by the use of unnamed reference. When receivers come across a pronoun or a determiner, they have to mentally identify the linked nominal in order to make sense of the text. This has a very strong cohesive force. Take a look at the following advertising discourse (see example 13). The personal pronoun *we* and the demonstrative pronoun *that* are employed in this advertising text to refer to *Rolex* and the slogan *will never change the world*, respectively. Various types of repetitions based on references are among the most explicit cohesive devices in text. In this connection, the following text is quite symptomatic (see example 14). The author (Ernest Hemingway) constructed this fictional text focusing on the explicit repetitions of the word circle at the beginning and the end. Other repetitions, *fish-fish-fish*, *he-he-he-he-he*, and *too far-too far*, are also very important construal elements in this discourse.

Conjunctions and adverbs are also very important cohesive elements in text. Some authors, such as Hemingway, frequently use them to construct their literary texts. According to Gibson (1966), the usage of the conjunction *and* to mark additive and temporal relations is very typical for the style of Ernest Hemingway. It is interesting to note that some researchers even call such frequent usages of grammatical elements over-cohesive (Simpson 1992). Take a look at the following literary text (see

example 15). Although Hemingway builds this text through various grammatical and lexical devices, the conjunction *and* is the key cohesive element, which marks the additive relations. This conjunction, as well as the adverb *then*, are also very important tools to mark the temporal sequence in discourse (see example 16). This piece of narrative text clearly demonstrates how conjunctions and adverbs can function to construct text based on a temporal sequence. Another important signal of the temporal sequence in text is the enumerative adverb. The usages of these adverbs are quite common in different text types as they are very effective tools in the process of text construction (see example 17). This piece of text from US President Trump's Address to A Joint Session of Congress clearly shows the potential of the enumerative adverbs *First*, *Secondly*, *Thirdly*, *Fourthly*, and *Finally* in the construction of text.

Conjunctions and adverbs are also used to construct text based on contrast and cause-effect relations. It should be stressed that the usage of these grammatical devices is common as they are very instrumental tools to build cohesion and coherence in text (see example 18). The sender of this political text (the former UK Prime Minister David Cameron) constructs it through various cohesive devices in order to deliver his arguments, and the conjunction *and* is one of the most powerful and convincing tools in this political text.

It is necessary to stress that some grammatical elements are used in text for different functions that cannot easily be separated. Therefore, we have to take note that some confusion can emerge during the analysis of the textual functions of those grammatical elements. For example, sometimes the indefinite article is used not for the purpose of signalling new information, but for the classifying the object, thing, or notion it refers to. The same is true for the definite article, which classifies, identifies, and indicates uniqueness, or the time adverb *now*, which signals time. But the major part of the information contained in the use of the grammatical elements exists within the basic structure of text. A sender is