*Gunel EYVAZLI,*
*orcid.org/0000-0003-0418-7020*
*Postgraduate student of the Department of Turkish Literature*
*Azerbaijan University of Languages*
*(Baku, Azerbaijan) cafareyvazli@mail.ru*

# THE TEXT AS A STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC AND COMMUNICATIVE UNITY (ON THE MATERIAL OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE)

*The term text is ambiguous, and this aspect is evident in its interpretation in linguistic terminology, as well as in the literature on textual linguistics. In the article the text is considered as structural-semantic and communicative unity, the elements of which are divided into predicative and relative, i.e. more significant and less significant in their importance. The text as a whole speech work and its separate units are thought only through the concept of coherence. Coherence is the interposition of the elements of a text that ensures its perception. The notion of coherence is semantic, it relates, most of all, to all semantic relations that exist in the text. The category of coherence is highlighted from the point of view of the semantic relations of the components of the text and the means of expression of this category. Themes / rheme interrelationships in the structure of the text are highlighted. When considering these problems, in the foreground, various aspects of the relationship between the sentence and the text are put forward. Themes / rheme interrelationships is a universal method of semantic interpretation of the text. Under the semantic organization of the text is understood such structure of the text, which in the best way expresses its informative content. The dynamic process, that lies at the heart of semantic interpretation of text, is described. The text, which includes this utterance, expresses a single topic on which all its propositions are set. A single topic unites separate sentences in the text, establishes semantic relations between them and actualizes them. Thus, the context acts as the determining factor of the semantic complex.*

*Communicative linguistics allows a new approach to the theory of text creation. At the same time, the notion of a text includes both written and oral form. On the assumption of the provisions of communicative-semantic theory of utterance, we consider the text as a dynamic structure, created by a speaker (writer) in accordance with its communicative strategy.*

*Analyzing the ready texts, we deal with the ready communicative-meaningful arrangement of semantic material. Therefore, the task of the researcher is included revealing that dynamic process that which lies at the heart of semantic interpretation of the given text.*

***Key words:*** *text, complex syntactic whole, sentence, utterance, connection, dynamic structure, context, theme, rheme, communication, pragmatics, semantic interpretation.*

*Гюнель ЕЙВАЗЛІ,*
*orcid.org/0000-0003-0418-7020*
*аспірант кафедри турецької літератури*
*Азербайджанського університету мов*
*(Баку, Азербайджан) cafareyvazli@mail.ru*

# ТЕКСТ ЯК СТРУКТУРНО-СМИСЛОВА ТА КОМУНІКАТИВНА ЄДНІСТЬ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ)

*Термін текст неоднозначний, і цей аспект проявляється в його тлумаченні в лінгвістичній термінології, а також у літературі з текстологічної лінгвістики. У статті текст розглядається як структурно-смислова та комунікативна єдність, елементи якої поділяються на предикативні та релятивні, тобто більш значущі та мени значущі за своєю значимістю. Текст як цілісний мовленнєвий твір та його окремі одиниці продумуються лише через поняття зв'язності. Зв'язність – це взаєморозміщення елементів тексту, що забезпечує його сприйняття. Поняття зв'язності є семантичним, воно стосується, насамперед, усіх смислових відношень, які існують у тексті. Категорія зв'язності виділена з точки зору смислових відношень компонентів тексту та засобів вираження цієї категорії. Висвітлюються взаємозв'язки теми/реми в структурі тексту. При розгляді цих проблем на перший план висуваються різні аспекти взаємозв'язку між реченням і текстом. Взаємозв'язки теми/реми – це універсальний метод смислової інтерпретації тексту. Під смисловою організацією тексту розуміють таку структуру тексту, яка найкращим чином виражає його інформативний зміст. Описано динамічний процес, що лежить в основі семантичної інтерпретації тексту. Текст, який містить це висловлювання, виражає єдину тему, на якій поставлені всі його пропозиції. Одна тема об'єднує окремі речення в тексті, встановлює між ними смислові зв'язки та актуалізує їх. Таким чином, контекст виступає як визначальний фактор семантичного комплексу.*

*Комунікативна лінгвістика допускає новий підхід до теорії творення тексту. При цьому поняття тексту включає як письмову, так і усну форму. Виходячи з положень комунікативно-семантичної теорії висловлювання, ми*

розглядаємо текст як динамічну структуру, створену мовцем (письменником) відповідно до його комунікативної стратегії.

Аналізуючи готові тексти, ми маємо справу з готовим комунікативно-змістовним розташуванням смислового матеріалу. Тому в завдання дослідника входить розкриття того динамічного процесу, що лежить в основі смислової інтерпретації даного тексту.

**Ключові слова:** *текст, складне синтаксичне ціле, речення, висловлювання, зв'язок, динамічна структура, контекст, тема, рема, комунікація, прагматика, семантична інтерпретація.*

**Introduction.** The term text is ambiguous, and this aspect is evident in its interpretation in linguistic terminology, as well as in the literature on textual linguistics. In the article the text is considered as structural-semantic and communicative unity, the elements of which are divided into predicative and relative, i.e. more significant and less significant in their importance. Syntax, semantics and pragmatics play a key role in the linguistic analysis of the text. Syntax is based on the relationship of symbols to each other and covers the relationship between text units. Cohesion is also included in this composition. One of the central directions of research on the semantics of the text is to reveal the completeness of the text, the parameters of its content. Although it is important to clarify the formal and semantic features of the text, the functional-pragmatic organization of the text is now more prominent.

The analysis of structural-formative factors is one of the most important problems of the text linguistics. This problem includes not only lexico-grammatical means of linking the components of the whole and their semantic-syntactic structure, but also a different kind of relationship of separate structural-semantic units, forming a text (Гальперин, 1981; Слюсарева, 1982).

**Discussion.** What is generally accepted in linguistics is the consideration of not a individual sentences, but of interrelation of sentences in the compositional-semantic organization of the text. There are different means of linking of sentences, but they all serve to provide meaningful organization of the text. M.Halliday and R.Hasan not accidentally note that the concept of connectivity (linking) is semantic, it concerns all semantic relations that exist in the text (Halliday, Hasan, 1976, p. 4). The development of the theory of semantic structure of the text has a fundamental meaning for the text linguistics. So, G.V.Kolshansky notes that "the formal structure of the text, the semantic composition of the text, the poetic expression of thoughts, the comprehensibility of the text, and so on - all these problems at a significant level depend on how much the theory of the semantic structure of the text will be developed" (Kolshansky, 1980, p.20).

The results of linguistic research in the text show that there are certain rules for combining sentences with each other, which all still carry a non-prescriptive, but a recommendatory character. However, in the context of relationship, the dependence of a complex syntactic whole (CSW) is less than the sentence: when separating from the whole text the CSW does not change its meaning. The dependence of the CSW from the context is mainly manifested in the fact that "within" a single unit, dedicated to a specific topic, other topics "are born" that have a potential for further or future development or organization. Such kind of thematic transitions "cement" separate CSWs in the text - a single whole of the superior order.

Describing the modern situation in the linguistic theory of the text, O.I. Moskalskaya writes:

"Under the text is understood, one the one side, any utterance, consisting of one or several sentences …, however, on the other hand, such speech work, as a story, a novel, a newspaper or a magazine" (Москальская, 1981a, p.12). Objecting to the synonymous use of the terms "utterance" and "text", she suggests introducing a inverted utterance for the characteristics of a supra-phrasal unit as a syntactic unit, characterized by a feature of monothematism and the relationship of a communicative (thematic) progression (Danes, 1974). At the same time the inverted utterance is opposed by the sentence-utterance and the sentence-constituent of the utterance (Moskalskaya, 1981b, p.16-17).

Based on the concept of the inverted utterance, researchers focus on the discovery of the relationship between the utterances, on defining the logical structure of thought, presented in the text. Therefore, in the theory of the text, the center of gravity is transferred from the concept of utterance to the concept of inverted (or complex) utterance. Of the functional characteristics of the utterance, a theme / rheme structure is specially distinguished (Slyusareva, 1981, p.85), of the semantic ones - logical-semantic type of communication differs. Meanwhile, the functional properties of utterances, which are important from the point of view of communicative theories of speech activity, are studied not in the theory of utterances, but in the field of linguistics, which received the title of "pragmatic linguistics" or pragmatic theory of a sentence (Dijk, 1972, p. 36).

Studying a sentence as a unit of nomination, it is possible to consider its properties in the paradigmatic aspect as predicative-argumentative frames, developed at the expense of adding other semantic elements.

Here we base on the ontological nature of language models of propositions or sentences. However, every sentence acquires a single reading in specific conditions of communication. For its characteristics, functional indicators are essential: a sentence turns into an utterance. Here it is stands in the same line with non-propositional (non-sentence) structures, which are also utterances. Non-propositional (non-sentence) structures -expressions do not have those signs, which characterize the sentence as a structural-semantic unit, since their structure and semantics are the phenomena of another level rather than the predicative-argumentative framework and its semantic complicators.

Considering the text as a purposeful speech work, researchers usually pay the main attention to the problem of highlighting the units. The most wide-spread one is the term and the concept of "a complex syntactic whole." However, the theorists of syntactic science and the representatives of the textological directions strive to emphasize mainly its structural-semantic features, which make them kindred with a sentence, and consequently, allow "a complex syntactic whole" to be considered a unit of syntax, though more than a sentence. (Головенко, 1983, p.34; Мамедов, 2019, p.79)

There is, however, another approach to the analysis of the text: not from the position of its division, but from the position of its creation, generation. In this case, the attention of researchers is focused on the study of communication among separate units of the text (Infantova, 2008, p.76; Syrov, 2005). By identifying the semantics of a connection, they rely here on the structural-semantic features of the sentence. Here, static system units - sentences - are proposed, however, the dynamic aspect must localize their connections and attachments.

Communicative linguistics allows a new approach to the theory of text creation. At the same time, the notion of a text includes both written and oral form. On the assumption of the provisions of communicative-semantic theory of utterance, we consider the text as a dynamic structure, created by a speaker (writer) in accordance with its communicative strategy. In such an approach, the original is considered not a sentence, i.e., structurally formed unit, but that nominative (semantic) material, which speaker (writer) arranges in accordance with his/her communicative purpose. In this respect, the opinion of I.P.Susov is presented as quite fairly, that "the main text-forming factor is the intention of a speaker". (Сусов, 1979, p.101).

Analyzing the ready texts, we deal with the ready communicative-meaningful arrangement of semantic material. Therefore, the task of the researcher is included

revealing that dynamic process that which lies at the heart of semantic interpretation of the given text.

Let us give an example of a corresponding analysis of the text describing the semantic situation of being/existing.

*1. Once upon a time there lived in the north country a certain poor man and his wife, who had two corn-fields, three cows, five sheep, and thirteen children (F. Browne. The Story of Merry Mind).*

In the communicative interpretation of this situation, the speaker bases on the existential predicate, which acquires the status of the theme, and the existing object appears in the communicative focus of the message.

The second part of this sentence is an independent utterance based on the semantic structure of possession (or availability). Here, in the rhematic position, the listed objects of possession stay. Text organization, i.e. combination of two utterances, goes along the line of characteristics of those which were introduced in the first utterance of people from the point of view of the semantic sign of the area. It is not difficult to guess that the further organization of the text will be associated with the characteristics of one of the listed objects of the possession. In this case there are two utterances, combined in the communicative structure, which in this case corresponds to a complex sentence (This is one of the cases when a complex sentence corresponds to two utterances). Although all the listed items of the possession are given with quantitative characteristics, the only one that is important for the organization or the development of this text is the last one - *thirteen.*

The further text organization is directly related to this characteristic: *Twelve of these children were called by names common in the northern country - Hardhead, Stiffneck, Tightfingers, and the like; but when the thirteenth came to be named, either the poor man and his wife could remember no other name, or something in the child's look made them think it proper, for they called him Merrymind, which the neighbors thought a strange name, and very much above their station; however, as they showed no other signs of pride, the neighbors let that pass* (Browne, 2011).

This text corresponds to one sentence when approaching it from the syntactic point of view. Its analysis from the position of the communicative-semantic content, based primarily on the identification of the communicative strategy, which was guided by the author in the arrangement of semantic interpretation of the text, discloses the path – naming of objects of speech and evaluation of the name.

The given text is characterized by two semantic nuclei. Let us consider how these semantic cores are presented in the communicative arrangement of the

text. The text represents two communicative structures based on the logical-semantic sign of opposition. The first one of them ends with the word *Merrymind* and turns on the linking signal *but*. The opposition is along the semantic line of naming, and the evaluation is presented as a secondary semantic line. It should be noted that the author gives a contradiction not in a direct logical form (such as a *common name - a strange name,* where the notions are contradicted), but in the form of a contradiction of situations, which, apparently, could be called a communicative juxtaposing. Each of these utterances entering the first communicative structure, in turn, is complicated by additional semantic operations: the first - the exact listing of the name, but the second - the contamination with cause-effect logical structure. The second communicative structure (*which… pass*) is also based on the juxtaposition, expressed by the conjunctive pronoun *however*. In this case, the juxtaposition is built, firstly, along evaluative semantic line. The first statement is complicated by the adoption of a double evaluation, but the second one is built in the form of a causal-effect logical structure. Thus, the interpretation of this text is determined by a quantitative semantic element and occurs in two semantic lines, each of which is represented by the communicative structures with juxtaposition. This type of text interpretation can be called a two-pronged semantic progression.

2. *Once upon a time there was a king whose name was Samuel. He was sitting on the throne one afternoon thinking how nice it would be to go for a ride in a railway train to see his Grann. So he said good-bye to the Queen and set off* (Bisset, 1967).

The original sentence, although it is one complex utterance about the existing object, which is also characterized simultaneously by the name. The whole nominative complex *was a king whose name was Samuel* appears in the rhematic focus. The nomination is expressed by means of analytical way, i.e. the notion about a class (*a king*) and a concrete reference (*whose name was Samuel*) are given separately. The organization of the text goes along the line of singling out the action introduced in the narration of the subject of the speech. Here one-sided semantic structure of text organization comes out.

3. *For three days there had been a gale from the west, but now it was nearly calm again and the sea was blue. The Atlantic swell still broke on the cliffs, thudding and slapping and splashing great fountains high in the air, but the bay there was smooth water! The tide was out, and Timothy and Hew and Sam were looking for treasure* (Linklater, 1951).

In the given extract, the interpretation of the text is constructed along three semantic lines: description

of the state of nature, description of the state of the ocean, description of the actions of the heroes of the story. The first two semantic lines are represented by the communicative structure with the juxtaposition, the third one - by the communicative structure with the cause-effect linking. In the first case, the juxtaposition goes according to temporary parameter, in the second one - according to the semantic sign of statism.

We also note that the last utterance of the first communicative structure contains two rhemes: *nearly calm* and *the sea was blue.* The highlighting of the "whole sentence" (*the sea blue*) as a rheme of the utterance, obviously, may seem controversial, that's why we should discuss this issue in more details.

It is known that the theme and rheme are marked in the sentence, which is included in the specific context, i.e. in discourse. At present, two principal conclusions are made of this:

1) the construction of the discourse is based on the theme / rheme principle (Slyusareva, 1982a, p.40).

2) the notions of theme / rheme and hierarchical, i. e. at each level of analysis it is possible to distinguish the theme / rheme. (Shevyakova, 1980, p.32).

Based on these two positions, the notions of theme / rheme, unconditionally, should be expanded by comparing with those ones, which are marked within sentences, they should include larger units. Ch. Lee and S. Thompson, in particular, write about this, referring to theme as a series of constructions that occur within the propositions (sentences). (Li, Thomson, 1976, p.484), for example, *As for education (Topic), John prefers Russel's ideas (comment) rheme).*

This example shows that the theme and rheme do not always correspond to the members of the sentence. The other approach to the solution of this problem is by G. A. Zolotova.

Preserving the notion of rheme for a particular member of the sentence, for the text it introduces a much broader term - the rhematic dominant of the text (Zolotova, 1979, p.120). N.A.Slyusareva notes that the discourse (a text fragment) is built on the expression of predictiveness, not having formal indicators, in contrast to the subject-predicate predictiveness (Slyusareva, 1982b, p. 40).

"The content has its own, different from the sentence and the supraphrasal unity of the form of the predication," - I.R.Galperin also writes in this connection (Halperin, 1981, p.21). Thus, the rheme of the utterance, which is a unit of text, does not necessarily have to coincide with the subject-predicate predictiveness division, although in the case of a hierarchical division, first of all, subject will be thematic element till the semantic bases of the sentence. it is necessary to add to the semantic basis the basic

premise of the whole sentence. At the level of the text, not only separate constructions, but also the whole subject-predicate sentences can act as a single element of the communicative structure - theme or rheme.

Continuing the analysis of the communicative organization of this text, let us see the second communicative structure: *The Atlantic swell… water.* The opposition here goes along several semantic lines, but for the communication process, the most important is the implicit-explicit opposition on the static semantic line: *Rough water - smooth water,* which reflects the author's intention, which is to switch the reader's attention to the subsequent events that took place in this situation.

Conclusion. Finally, the concluding communicative structure includes two utterances, a connected with the conjunction *and*, which expresses a hidden cause-effect relationship between/among events, on the basis of which the utterance is made. In both cases, the theme / rheme division of the textual units - utterances. This example is characterized by a three-sided semantic interpretation of the text.

Thus, the analysis of the text is based on the identification of its functional-semantic components, in which separate communicative-semantic units of the utterance within the communicative-semantic structures take part. In this case, not only the linearity of the text, but also the means of explication of the complex semantic material, determined by the communicative purpose of the speaker (writer) is taken as a basis.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. М.: Наука, 1981, 139 с.
2. Головенко Ю. А. Текстоструктуры современного английского языка. Смоленск: СГПИ, 1983, 133 с.
3. Золотова Г. А. Роль ремы в организации и типологии текста. Синтаксис текста. М.: Наука, 1979, с. 113-134.
4. Инфантова Г. Г. Современные тенденции реализации текстовых категорий цельности, связности и расчлененности. Филологические науки. 2008, № 6, с. 74-78.
5. Колшанский Г. В. Контекстная семантика. М.: Наука, 1980, 154 с.
6. Мамедов Н. Ш. Текст и языковая коммуникация. Баку: Мутарджим, 2019, 252 с.
7. Москальская О. И. Грамматика текста. М.: Высшая школа, 1981. 183 с.
8. Николаева Т. М. О чем рассказывают нам тексты? М.: Языки славянских культур, 2012, 328 с.
9. Слюсарева Н. А. Проблемы функционального синтаксиса современного английского языка. М.: Наука, 1981. 208 с.
10. Слюсарева Н. А. Лингвистика речи и лингвистика текста. Аспекты общей и частной лингвистической теории текста. М.: Наука, 1982, с. 22-41.
11. Сусов И. П. О двух путях исследования содержания текста. Значение и смысл речевых образований. Калинин: КГУ, 1979, с. 90-103.
12. Сыров И. А. Способы реализации категории связности в художественном тексте. М.: МПГУ, 2005, 277 с.
13. Шевякова В. Е. Современный английский язык. Порядок слов, актуальное членение, интонация. М.: Наука, 1980, 383 с.
14. Browne F. The Story of Merry Mind. London. 2011. 120 p.
15. Bisset D. Two a Penny. London. 1967. 129 p.
16. Danes F. Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organization of the Text. Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective. Praha: Academia, 1974, p. 106-128.
17. Dijk T. A. van. Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse. The Hague etc.: Mouton, 1981. 331 p.
18. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. Longman, 1976, XY. – English Lang. Ser. 9). 374 p.
19. Li Ch. N., Thompson S. A. Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language. In: Subject and Topic. New York, 1976, p. 453-489.
20. Linklater E.. Laxdale Hall. London. 1951. 301 p.

## REFERENCES

1. Gal'perin I. R. Tekst kak obiekt lingvisticheskogo issledovanija[Text as an object of linguistic research]. M.: Nauka, 1981, 139 p. [in Russian]
2. Golovenko Ju. A. Tekstostruktury sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka. [Text structures of modern English]. Smolensk: SGPI, 1983, 133 p. [in Russian]
3. Zolotova G. A. Rol' remy v organizacii i tipologii teksta. Sintaksis teksta. [The role of the rheme in the organization and typology of the text. Syntax of the text]. M.: Nauka, 1979, p. 113-134. [in Russian]
4. Infantova G. G. Sovremennye tendencii realizacii tekstovyh kategorij cel'nosti, svjaznosti i raschlenennosti. Filologicheskie nauki. [Modern trends in the implementation of textual categories of integrity, connectivity and dismemberment. Philological Sciences]. 2008, no. 6, p. 74-78. [in Russian]
5. Kolshanskij G. V. Kontekstnaja semantika. [Contextual semantics]. M.: Nauka, 1980, 154 p. [in Russian]
6. Mamedov N. Sh. Tekst i jazykovaja kommunikacija. [Text and language communication]. Baku: Mutarjim, 2019, 252 p. [in Russian]
7. Moskal'skaja O. I. Grammatika teksta. [Grammar of the text]. Moscow: Higher school, 1981. 183 p. [in Russian]
8. Nikolaeva T. M. O chem rasskazyvajut nam teksty? [What do the texts tell us? ] M.: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2012, 328 p. [in Russian]

9. Sljusareva N. A. Problemy funkcional'nogo sintaksisa sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka. [Problems of functional syntax of modern English]. M.: Nauka, 1981. 208 p. [in Russian]

10. Sljusareva N. A. Lingvistika rechi i lingvistika teksta. Aspekty obshhej i chastnoj lingvisticheskoj teorii teksta. [Speech Linguistics and Text Linguistics. Aspects of General and Private Linguistic Theory of Text]. M.: Nauka, 1982, p. 22-41. [in Russian]

11. Susov I. P. O dvuh putjah issledovanija soderzhanija teksta. Znachenie i smysl rechevyh obrazovanij. [On two ways of studying the content of the text. Meaning and meaning of speech formations]. Kalinin: KGU, 1979, p. 90-103. [in Russian]

12. Syrov I. A. Sposoby realizacii kategorii svjaznosti v hudozhestvennom tekste. [Ways to implement the category of connectivity in a literary text]. M.: MPGU, 2005, 277 p. [in Russian]

13. Shevjakova V. E. Sovremennyj anglijskij jazyk. Porjadok slov, aktual'noe chlenenie, intonacija. [Modern English. Word order, actual articulation, intonation]. M.: Nauka, 1980, 383 p. [in Russian]

14. Browne F. The Story of Merry Mind. London. 2011. 120 p.

15. Bisset D. Two a Penny. London. 1967. 129 p.

16. Danes F. Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organization of the Text. Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective. Praha: Academia, 1974, p. 106-128.

17. Dijk T. A. van. Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse. The Hague etc.: Mouton, 1981. 331 p.

18. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. Longman, 1976, XY. – English Lang. Ser. 9). 374 p.

19. Li Ch. N., Thompson S. A. Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language. In: Subject and Topic. New York, 1976, p. 453-489.

20. Linklater E.. Laxdale Hall. London. 1951. 301 p.