REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN

On the rights of the manuscript

ABSTRACT

of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

COHESION AND INFORMATIONALITY IN ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI LITERARY TEXTS

Specialty: 5714.01 – Comparative-historical and
                   comparative-typological linguistics

Field of science: Philology

Applicant: **Aynur Mirali Rzayeva**

Baku – 2025

The dissertation was performed at the Department of Lexicology and Stylistics of the English Language under the Faculty of Philology and Journalism at Azerbaijan University of Languages.

Scientific supervisor: Doctor of Philological Sciences, professor
                                      Afgan Ali Abdullayev

Official opponents: Doctor of Philological Sciences,Assoc.Prof.
                                      Banovsha Guloghlan Mammadova

                                      Doctor of Philosophy in Philology
                                      Elnura Alim Abbasova

                                      Doctor of Philosophy in Philology
                                      Parvana İsmayil Pashayeva

The Dissertation Council ED 1.06, operating under the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi, within the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences and under the Higher Attestation Commission of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, is constituted as the BFD 1.06 Ad hoc Dissertation Council.

Chairman of the Ad hoc   Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Dissertation Council: Professor
                                      Nadir Balaoghlan Mammadli

Scientific Secretary of the   Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Ad hoc Dissertation Council: Associate professor
                                      Sevinj Yusif Mammadova

Chairman of the Ad hoc   Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Scientific Seminar: Associate professor
                                      Valeh Bayram Nasibov

INTRODUCTION

The Relevance of the Theme and the Intensity of its Elaboration. The text serves as a medium where the linguistic system manifests itself. Text theory regards the text as an immanent structure and an autosemantic phenomenon. The internal organization of a text has consistently attracted the attention of linguists, as it represents an organic unity, a cohesive whole whose integrity is maintained through internal relationships. Coherence in texts is established through semantic-formal tools. To be regarded as a unified whole, a text must exhibit coherence. A text can fulfill its function only when it is fully formed, integrating formal-semantic relationships while maintaining integrative and informative characteristics. Furthermore, a text must possess its own unique, unified content, meaningful relationships, and grammatical and lexical independence.

The formation and explanation of the communicative function of the text have always been focal points for linguists. The cohesion of texts depends on both implicative and explicative relationships within the text. Explicit connections are created through formal linguistic tools, whereas implicit connections involve subtext, authorial intention, and textual pragmatics. Ensuring textual coherence is achieved through the use of cohesive and coherent devices. Analysis of theoretical literature reveals the challenges in clearly delineating the boundary between cohesive and coherent tools that contribute to text coherence. The comparative analysis of English and Azerbaijani texts, focusing on lexical and grammatical aspects, highlights the relevance of this topic. The parameters reflecting the systematization of textual cohesion are influenced by informationality, a critical communicative factor.The category of informationality in a text is defined as the distribution of various types and aspects of content information, which inherently involves both a source and an addressee, from a communicative perspective. Every text serves the purpose of conveying specific information, shaping its narrative structure. The distribution of information within texts varies across genres, including prose and verse. Generally,

information is disseminated sequentially, in parallel, or in a mixed manner within a text.

In realizing informationality within a text, the categories of cohesion and coherence play direct roles. The communicative essence of informationality necessitates its examination from both semantic and pragmatic perspectives. Semantically, informationality pertains to the relationship between the text and extralinguistic reality, while pragmatically, it addresses the interaction between the text and its participants (e.g., author and reader, speaker and listener). The relevance of this research topic is dictated by the theoretical demands of contemporary anthropocentric linguistic paradigms. These paradigms explore various aspects of texts informational, structural, linguistic and seek to refine the nomenclature of text categories and elucidate their interrelationships.

Extensive scholarly work has been devoted to studying the cohesion category of texts, ranging from classical research by A.A. Potebnia, Z.Harris, I.R. Galperin, M.A.K. Halliday, R. Hasan, R.A. de Beaugrande, T.A. van Dijk, N.L. Fairclough, V.Dressler, G.Y. Solganik, V.Edmundson, K.M. Abdullayev, and G.Sh. Kazımov[1], to

[1] Potebnia, A.A. Aesthetics and Poetics / Edited by Ovsyannikov, M.F. (foreword) et al. A.A. Potebnia. – Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1976. – 613 p.; Harris, Z. Discourse Analysis: A sample text // – New York, Language, – 1952. 28, – p.1-30; Galperin, I.R. Text as an Object of Linguistic Study / I.R. Galperin. – Moscow: Nauka, 1981. – 138 p.; Halliday, M.A.K. Cohesion in English. / M.A.K.Halliday, R.Hasan. – London: Longman, – 1976. – 392 p.; Beaugrande, de R. Introduction to Text Linguistics. / R.Beaugrande de, W.Dressler. – Cambridge: Routledge, – 1981. – 286 p; Van Dijk, T.A. Issues in the Pragmatics of Text // Moscow: Progress, New Developments in Foreign Linguistics, 1978, Vol. 8, pp. 259-336; Van Dijk, T.A. Language, Cognition, Communication / Translated from English / T.A. van Dijk. – Moscow: Progress, 1989. – 312 p.; Fairclough, N.L. Analysing Discourse-Textual analysis for social research. / N.Fairclough. – Routledge: Taylor & Francis e-Library, – 2004. – 288 p; Dressler, V. Syntax of Text // Moscow, New Developments in Foreign Linguistics, 1978, Vol. VIII, pp. 111-137; Solganik, G.Y. Stylistics of Text / G.Y. Solganik. – Moscow: Flinta; Nauka, 2000. – 253 p.; Edmondson, W. Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis. / W. Edmondson. – London: Sage, – 1981. – 217 p.; Abdullayev, K.M. Theoretical Problems of Azerbaijani Syntax / K. Abdullayev. – Baku: Maarif, 1998. – 284 p.; Kazımov, G. Modern Azerbaijani Language. Syntax / G. Kazımov. – Baku: Unsiyyat, 2000. – 496 p.

more recent studies by F.Y.Veysalli, V.G.Borbotko, A.A. Abdullayev, A.Y. Mammadov, V.N.Ibishova, and S.B. Mustafayeva[2]. These studies examine cohesion in literary prose, poetry, and scientific texts. Despite the breadth of research, the interplay between the categories of cohesion and informationality remains insufficiently explored, particularly regarding their comprehensive analysis across content, structure, and linguistic dimensions.

Object and Subject of the Research. The object of this research comprises various genres of literary texts in English and Azerbaijani. The subject focuses on the study and systematization of the main categories - cohesion and informationality - that contribute to the formation of literary texts.

Purpose and Objectives of the Research. The primary goal of this research is to examine cohesion as a central textual category in relation to informationality. The interaction of key textual categories is understood through the mutual influence of their parameters, identifying correlations between formal-structural (cohesion) and communicative-pragmatic (informationality) characteristics of texts. To achieve this goal, the following objectives are addressed:

- to identify the parameters that define the status of a text through cohesion and informationality;

---

[2] Veysalli, F.Y. Introduction to discourse analysis. / F.Y. Veysalli. – Baku: Education NPM, – 2010. – 141 p.; Borbotko, V.G. Elements of Discourse Theory / V.G. Borbotko. – Grozny: Checheno-Ingush State University named after L.N. Tolstoy, 1981. – 113 p.; Abdullayev, A.A. Actual Constituents and Tex. / A.A.Abdullayev. – Baku: Khazar University Press, – 1998. – 189 p.; Abdullayev, A.A. Models of Text Comprehension / A.A.Abdullayev. – Baku: Sada, – 1999. – 345 p.; Mammadov, A.Y. Cognitive Perspectives of Discourse Analysis / A.Y. Mammadov, M.Y. Mammadov. – Baku: Chasioghlu, 2010. – 96 p.; Mammadov, A.Y. Discourse Research / A.Y. Mammadov. – Baku: Baku University Press, 2013. – 78 p.; Ibishova, V.N. Logical-Semantic Cohesion of Texts in Azerbaijani: Abstract of the PhD Dissertation in Philology – Baku: ANAS Publishing House, 2018. – 31 p.; Mustafayeva, S.B. Experimental-Phonetic Study of Discourse Intonation (Based on the Materials of English and Azerbaijani Languages): Abstract of the PhD Dissertation in Philology – Baku: Science and Education, 2018. – 25 p.

- to classify the informational types of literary texts based on factual (subject-logical) and modal (subject-evaluative) information;

- to investigate linguistic categories and the principles underlying their definition;

- to analyze various approaches to linguistic categories from structural, cognitive, and semantic perspectives;

- to distinguish the similarities and differences between literary texts and discourse;

- to explore the history of text and discourse studies, emphasizing the role of internal connections and authorial intention in text linguistics;

- to examine types of cohesion critical to the formation of literary texts and analyze how cohesive tools contribute to textual creation;

- to determine the role of cohesion in shaping informationality;

- to conduct a comparative study of cohesion and informationality features in English and Azerbaijani literary texts;

- to explain the text from linguistic, cognitive, and social perspectives.

Research Methods. The research employs deductive, inductive, structural, componential, transformational, traditional analytical-descriptive, and comparative-contrastive methods. These methodologies facilitate a comprehensive exploration of cohesion and informationality as integral components of text formation and analysis.

The Main Provisions Put Out for Defense:

1. The structural-semantic and formal-linguistic parameters of cohesion manifest differently in literary texts of various informational types. This variation reflects the relationships between the main types of cohesion in the text, as well as the formal-linguistic expression of cohesive tools that characterize the ways in which meaning relationships are expressed between the components of the text.

2. The formal-linguistic parameters of cohesion correlate with the semantic and pragmatic parameters of informationality, as

demonstrated in literary texts containing factual (subject-logical) and modal (subject-evaluative) information.

3. The variation of cohesive parameters in literary texts aligns with the pragmatic parameter of informationality, wherein the subjectivity of information transmission takes precedence over objectivity, and emphasis is placed on addressee-directedness rather than self-reference.

4. Cohesion is a critical text category in the process of text creation. Its primary function is to establish a structured sequence of various linguistic signs, their forms, and meanings.

5. Formal-logical and abstract-content cohesion underpin the structural and semantic organization of the text. Depending on the author's intention, the main tools expressing cohesion in a text include lexical, syntactic, stylistic, graphic, and logical-semantic devices.

6. The structural (linguistic) approach is the most effective method for analyzing linguistic categories, as these categories are shaped under the influence of social factors.

7. Categorization in language represents the simplest cognitive process; meaning is a conceptual event, and understanding these processes involves mechanisms such as association.

8. Implicit tools are more prevalent in the creation of literary texts compared to other text types. Literary texts are partially or largely informative and serve a communicative purpose.

The Scientific Novelty of the Research. The novelty of the research lies in uncovering the mechanisms of interaction between text categories in literary texts (in both English and Azerbaijani) through the correlation of their parameters. The scientific contribution of the study includes an in-depth analysis of cohesion and informationality as text categories in literary texts, utilizing materials from both English and Azerbaijani languages. Additionally, it systematically examines literary texts and the tools employed in their creation.

The Theoretical and Practical Significance of the Research. The theoretical significance of the research is rooted in the study of text linguistics, discourse, and literary texts, along with the tools employed in text creation and the theoretical ideas expressed about them. The work explores the interaction of text categories and their role in text formation, using materials from diverse linguistic systems. The principles established in this research can be applied to texts across various genres and styles.

The practical significance lies in the potential applications of the findings in the fields of English and Azerbaijani stylistics, theoretical grammar, and text linguistics courses. The results can also inform methods for analyzing literary texts, aid educators in selecting texts for different instructional stages, and serve as supplementary material in seminars and graduate-level linguistics courses.

Aprobation and Application of the Research Work. The topic of the research has been approved by the Scientific Council of the Azerbaijan University of Languages. The research findings have been presented at scientific conferences both nationally and internationally and have been discussed at departmental meetings. Seven articles and seven theses related to this topic have been published in both Azerbaijani and international publications.

Name of the Organization in which the Dissertation Work is Performed. The dissertation was performed at the Department of Lexicology and Stylistics of the English Language under the Faculty of Philology and Journalism at Azerbaijan University of Languages.

The Structure and Volume of the Dissertation, in Signs, Indicating the Volume of Each Structural Unit Separately.

The research consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a bibliography. The introductory part of the dissertation is 5 pages, 9 012 characters, chapter I is 26 pages, 52 717 characters, chapter II is 38 pages, 74 787 characters, chapter III is 40 pages, 76 610 characters. Conclusion is 4 pages, 7 263 characters. The total volume of the dissertation is 220 389 characters, excluding the list of used literature.

THE KEY CONTENT OF THE WORK

In the **"Introduction"** of the dissertation, the relevance of the topic is justified, the object and subject of the research are identified, and the aims and objectives of the study are outlined. The propositions presented for defense are introduced, and the scientific novelty, theoretical and practical significance, linguistic material, and research methods are discussed. Information regarding the approval, application, and structure of the work is also provided.

In the first chapter, titled **"Features of Language Categories"** the primary approaches to language and its categories are examined. The first paragraph, **"General Notes"** highlights two trends observed in prototype studies. The first[3] approach stems from cognitive psychology, focusing on concepts and their linguistic expression. The second approach is purely linguistic, emphasizing contrastive focus rather than solely the semantic structure of linguistic signs. Both approaches are interconnected, as linguistic data are employed to explain cognitive phenomena.

In theoretical literature, the unity of grammatical meaning and form is interpreted as a category. Linguistic categories are divided into two groups: *formal* (morphological and syntactic) and *semantic.* For instance, while Azerbaijani and English verbs differ in quantity, they share common grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, and mood.

The cognitive function of language serves as a symbolic model of the material world, enabling understanding of the surrounding environment. Functional interpretations of the world are reflected in linguistic categories that represent the semantic structure of language. Thus, language is the primary tool for categorizing the external world. Categorization occurs during daily interactions with the environment, linking conceptual structures between speakers and listeners.[4]

---

[3] Smith, E.E. and Medin, D.L. Strategies and classification learning // Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, – 1981. 7(4), – p.241.

[4] Clark H.H. Using Language / H.Clark. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, – 1996. – p.335.

Linguistic categories are expressed through word meanings, and the semantic structure of a language impacts these categories. Significant semantic variations in language influence both the understanding and categorization of linguistic elements. For example, according to E. Rosha, "*the choice of object in a sentence is entirely shaped within the context of time and intention*."[5]

In the first paragraph, titled **"Structural Approach to Language Categories"** it is noted that parts of speech are based on the concept of words. Plato first proposed the philosophical division of parts of speech, which was later refined by Aristotle.

R. Robins[6] and T. Davidson[7] classified parts of speech based on the following characteristics: nouns *(onoma)* are inflected parts of speech that indicate whether entities are concrete or abstract, general or specific, and they have five main categories. These categories include the category of number (singular and plural), gender (masculine, feminine, and neutral), form (simple, derived, compound), and case (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, locative). The verb (*rema*), on the other hand, is not inflected and is classified based on categories such as tense, person, number, voice (active/passive), and mood (indicative, imperative, subjunctive, infinitive), as well as form (simple, derived, compound), among others. In both English and Azerbaijani, the classification of parts of speech is based on a combination of semantic, morphological, and syntactic criteria.

A. Arno and K. Lanslo developed the concept of rational and universal grammar.[8] According to them, despite the surface-level differences in languages (in terms of expression), underlying universal logic and rational principles exist at a deeper level (in

[5] Rosch, E. Principles of Categorization / In: E.Rosch & B.B.Lloyd, (eds): Cognition and Categorization / E.Rosch. – Hillsdale, N.J.Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, – 1978. – p.29.

[6] Robins, R.H. The Development of the Word Class System of the European Grammatical Tradition. // Foundations of Language, – 1966. 2, – p. 10.

[7] Davidson, Th. The Grammar of Dionysius Thrax. / Th.Davidson. St. Louis: R.P.Studley, – 1874. – p.11.

[8] Arnauld, A. General and Rational Grammar: The Port-Royal Grammar. / A.Arnauld, C.Lancelot. – Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, – 1975. – p.90.

semantics). They distinguished between words that represent objects of thought and words that express the form and style of thinking, identifying nine parts of speech.[9]

L. Morin classified parts of speech based on two criteria.[10] The author described articles as determiners added before nominal entities, with their semantic meaning considered the grammatical meaning of the noun. Verbs were classified solely based on their semantic criterion and categorized as words indicating actions and states, such as *"to be," "to do,"* and *"to suffer."* A drawback of this classification is its lack of morphological features. O. Yespersen categorized parts of speech as follows: subjunctive, adjectives, pronouns, verbs, and particles (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions).[11] According to L. Bloomfield, "*it would not be correct to establish a complete sequential scheme of parts of speech because word groups overlap and intersect with each other*."[12] L.V. Langacker considered it a fundamental principle of modern linguistic theory that grammatical categories are not semantic but rather morphosyntactic.[13]

In the categorization of words in a language, both internal and external factors exist. M. Haspelmath refers to four criteria in the identification of words: "*orthographic, phonological, semantic, and morphosyntactic (grammatical)*."[14] In his view, "*the phenomenon of grammaticalization forms based on extralinguistic factors and is conditioned by the pragmatics between language and context users. Despite the difficulty of drawing a clear boundary between*

---

[9] Thomas, M. Fifty Key Thinkers on Language and Linguistics / M.Thomas – USA: London and New York, – 2011. – p.58.

[10] Murrey, L. English Grammar. / L.Murrey. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, – 1860 (2009). – p.30.

[11] Yespersen, O. The Philosophy of Grammar. / O.Yespersen. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, – 1924. New edition: – 1992. – p.90.

[12] Bloomfield, L. Language. / L.Bloomfield. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, – 1933. – p.196.

[13] Langacker, R.W. Concept, image and symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar. / R.W.Langacker. – Berlin& New York: Mouton de Gruyter, – 1990. – p.128.

[14] Haspelmath, M. How to Compare Major Word-Classes across the World's Languages. // UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics, – 2014. 17, – p.109.

pragmatics, semantics, and grammar, the general approach separates interpretation based on the structural aspects of the text and inference."[15]

In the third paragraph of Chapter I, titled **"Semantic Approach to Language Categories"** it is noted that when linguistic categories are approached semantically, the problem of defining the boundaries between word, phrase, and morpheme emerges as an important issue. In the field of conceptualization in language, cognitive approaches to semantics attract significant attention. Modular researchers believe that language consists of independent modules within consciousness. In contrast, R. Langacker,[16] C. Lakoff, and M. Johnson do not consider language to consist of independent modules with distinct principles within consciousness. According to them, "*linguistic knowledge is explained through psychological mechanisms within the mind*."[17] R. Langacker states that "*the general psychological characteristics of memory, as well as the ability to distinguish what is seen, represent a complex sequence of both psychological and grammatical events*."[18]

The goal of the cognitive approach to semantics is to describe the knowledge structures related to words in language. As a result, the conceptual representation of word meanings becomes richer and more comprehensive than in other semantic analyses. C. Lakoff proposes new models - Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs).[19] According to his model, the word *"bachelor"* represents an adult, unmarried, single individual, based on various background

---

[15] Haspelmath, M. The Indeterminacy of Word Segmentation and the Nature of Morphology and Syntax.// Folia Linguistica, – 2011. 45, – p.31.

[16] Langacker, R.W. Foundations of cognitive grammar. Theoretical prerequisites. / R.W.Langacker. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, – Vol. 1. – 1987. –p.100.

[17] Lakoff, G. Metaphors We Live By. / G.Lakoff, M.Johnson. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1st edición, – 1980. – p.42.

[18] Langacker, R.W. Foundations of cognitive grammar. Theoretical prerequisites. / R.W.Langacker. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, – Vol. 1. – 1987. –p.101.

[19] Lakoff, G. Cognitive models and prototype theory. / In U.Neisser (Ed.), Emory symposia in cognition, 1. Concepts and conceptual development: Ecological and intellectual factors in categorization //G.Lakoff. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, – 1987. – p. 63.

knowledge. Prototypical features are also observed within the model proposed by the author.

The semantic criterion is based on meaning. Words are categorized according to the meanings they express. Verbs express different meanings: action (go, swim), state (be, exist), and event (happen, occur), while nouns express living (proper nouns) and non-living (things and places) entities, and adjectives express qualities (features). However, such semantic categories cannot be considered perfect, as nouns not only express the categories listed but also abstract concepts. For example, nouns like *"honesty"* and *"freedom"* not only represent names but also encompass qualities or attributes.

The syntactic criterion is based on the distribution and function of different categories of words within a sentence. For example, in the sentence *"Harry walks a lot,"* replacing *"Harry"* with the noun *"Mary"* maintains grammatical correctness. It can also be replaced with the pronoun *"he."* Extending this, the proper noun *"Harry"* can be substituted with lexical units such as *"this guy"* or *"boy."* Substitution applies not only to individual words but also to word combinations. In a sentence, words must exhibit both syntactic and semantic coherence. For instance, when comparing the sentences *"Cats meow"* and *"Dogs meow,"* the sentence *"Cats meow"* exhibits both syntactic and semantic alignment, while *"Dogs meow"* does not achieve the same level of semantic coherence. Thus, although the sentence meets the syntactic criterion, it fails to fulfill the semantic requirement.

In the semantic approach to categories, a striking feature is the dominance of meaning relationships. For example, the word *"mother"* can have various shades of meaning, including biological mother, adoptive mother, spiritual mother, and carrier mother. In English, due to conversion, the word *"to mother"* reflects a different characteristic of the category. C. Lakoff, when referring to *"mothering,"* emphasizes that one of the most critical features defining a word within the semantic category is universality. He

states that "*the existence of exceptions cannot overshadow the function of motherhood*."[20]

In the fourth paragraph of Chapter I, titled **"Cognitive (Prototype) Approach to Language Categories"**, it is demonstrated that conceptual models of mental knowledge and word meaning require an internal representation of the world in thought. Prototype expressions form the center of a complex system. Based on experience, categories are defined, and words and concepts within those categories are abstracted. For example, the term *"fruit"* typically evokes *"apple"* as the prototypical instance rather than *"coconut."* Thus, in categorization, the characteristic of universality plays a significant role in the human brain's perception of that category.

According to prototype theory, all categories have two types of members: *the primary (model) member* and *the secondary member.* J. Lakoff referred to these members as prototypes.[21] For instance, when classifying birds like *"parrot"* and *"ostrich,"* he placed the parrot in the bird category based on its typical characteristics, while the ostrich, due to its inability to fly, was categorized with chickens. This demonstrates how prototype ideas influence conceptual categorization.

J. Lakoff,[22] a proponent of the prototype effect, argues that the theory simplifies the definition of linguistic categories. However, polysemy complicates categorization. For example, *"a long stick"* and *"a long time"* do not share the same meaning. In *"a long stick,"* the term *"long"* relates to its physical dimension, while in *"a long time,"* the temporal aspect is emphasized. A similar phenomenon occurs with polysemous words in Azerbaijani. For instance, the term *"fruit"* typically evokes examples such as *"apple, pear, banana,"* while many may not realize that *"olive"* is also classified as a fruit.

---

[20] Lakoff, G. Metaphors We Live By. / G.Lakoff, M.Johnson. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1st edición, – 1980. – p.76.

[21] Lakoff, G. Cognitive models and prototype theory. / In U.Neisser (Ed.), Emory symposia in cognition, 1. Concepts and conceptual development: Ecological and intellectual factors in categorization // G.Lakoff. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, – 1987. – p. 88.

[22] Ibid., p.88.

Chapter II, titled **"Cohesion in Texts,"** begins with the first paragraph, **"The History of Textual Research,"** noting that the concept of text has been interpreted differently by various linguists. Z. Harris, in analyzing a text, focused on breaking it down into connecting morphemes and identifying "equivalence" relationships.[23] In modern linguistics, the concept of "cohesion," which reflects structural relationships, was later refined by Z. Harris's student, N. Chomsky. N.Chomsky developed Harris's transformation method into the concept of "maximum equivalence."[24]

Another tradition in textual research is related to descriptivism. Descriptivists focused on the classification (grouping) of linguistic units. Z. Harris recognized the limitations of his structural equivalence method in capturing meaning relationships. His work demonstrates that cohesion in texts is formed through the repetition and parallelism of various syntactic structures across sentences.[25]

Texts analyzed from both formal-structural and semantic perspectives cannot be confined to syntactic boundaries. Formal-structural categories of a text include cohesion, topicalization, integration, continuity, prospection, and predicativity. Semantic categories include informativeness, pragmatics, presupposition, and subtext. I.R. Galperin noted that the structure of a text has yet to be fully studied.[26] While M.A.K. Halliday studied the text within a syntactic framework, he viewed it as a unit more significant than the sentence, emphasizing its information-transmitting function, or informativeness.[27] K.M. Abdullayev proposed two methods for text

[23] Harris, R. Saussure and his Interpreters / R.Harris. – New York: New York University Press, – 2001. – p.6.

[24] Chomsky, N. Syntactic Structures. / N.Chomsky. – London: Martino Fine Books, – 2015. – p.56.

[25] Harris, Z. Discourse Analysis:A sample text //–New York, Language, –1952. – p.25.

[26] Galperin, I.R. Text as an Object of Linguistic Study / I.R. Galperin. – Moscow: Nauka, – 1981. – 138 p.

[27] Halliday, M.A.K. Cohesion in English. / M.A.K.Halliday, R.Hasan. – London: Longman, – 1976. –p. 192.

analysis: propositional and communicative.[28] According to V.U. Dressler, "*the history of text linguistics is based on three foundations: rhetoric, stylistic analysis, and the structure of literary works*."[29]

J. Lyons' theory presents an interesting perspective on textual research. He views texts as contextual phenomena, explaining that contexts are formed in specific situations and reflect the transformation of the author's thoughts to the reader or listener.[30] In the cognitive paradigm, human cognition plays a central role in text analysis. A.A. Abdullayev stated, "*A person fluent in any language can understand any given text. However, the main role in text creation belongs to the proposition, as a text is a phenomenon that can only be understood in context.*"[31]

A.Y. Mammadov emphasizes that a sentence is merely an information-transmitting unit of a text. Continuing this thought, he writes: "*Every sentence, especially in non-literary styles such as scientific and journalistic styles, is sufficiently informative, including text headings.*"[32]

Cohesion and coherence are often discussed together, with cohesion considered language-specific and coherence society-specific.[33] M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan classified cohesion into grammatical cohesion (including pronouns, conjunctions, reference, and ellipsis) and lexical cohesion (including repetition, synonymy, etc.). For example:

---

[28] Abdullayev, K.M. Theoretical Problems of Azerbaijani Language Syntax / K. Abdullayev. – Baku: Maarif, – 1998. – p. 183.

[29] Beaugrande, de R. Introduction to Text Linguistics. / R.Beaugrande de, W.Dressler. – Cambridge: Routledge, – 1981. – p.32.

[30] Lyons, J. Language, Meaning and Context. / J.Lyons. – Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Fontana, – 1971. – p.156.

[31] Abdullayev, A.A. Text Comprehension Models / A.A. Abdullayev. – Baku: Sada, – 1999. – p. 145.

[32] Mammadov, A.Y. The System of Formal Linking Devices in Text Creation / A.Y. Mammadov. – Baku: Science, – 2001. – p. 14.

[33] Mammadov, A.Y. Discourse Studies / A.Y. Mammadov. – Baku: Baku University Press, – 2013. – 78 p.

"*The rain ceased as Nick turned onto the road that wound through the orchard. The harvest was over, and the autumn breeze rustled through the bare branches. Nick paused, noticing a Wagner apple lying on the ground by the roadside, its skin gleaming amidst the damp brown grass. He picked it up and tucked it into the pocket of his Mackinaw coat.*"[34]

In this passage, the sequence of events is connected through a sequential relation, beginning with Niki turning onto the path leading to the orchard, followed by picking the apple and placing it in her pocket. Additionally, simultaneity is employed in the paragraph. The second sentence creates parallelism with the description of the autumn wind picking the apple.

Let us consider an example of a literary text in Azerbaijani:

"*Bəri başdan, yəni səyahətdən əvvəl səni, Əziz Oxucu, adını artıq çəkdiyim iki gənclə daha yaxından tanış eləmək istəyirəm*".[35]

"*From the beginning, that is, before the journey, I would like to introduce you, dear reader, more closely to the two young people I've already mentioned by nam*e." *(A. Rzayeva)*

Here, the author refers to the story when mentioning the journey and attempts to draw the reader's attention with a metaphorical introduction.

In the second paragraph of Chapter II, titled **"Text and Discourse,"** it is noted that modern linguistics approaches literary texts from multiple perspectives. Initially, a text is viewed as a unit consisting of its components (sentences) and signs (phonemes, morphemes, lexemes). However, in contemporary linguistics, it is approached as a communicative-informative unit. The primary characteristic distinguishing a text from other linguistic units is its informativeness. One of the topics that has gained prominence in recent linguistics is discourse, which has increasingly attracted the attention of linguists. The concept of "discourse" was introduced to linguistics by Z. Harris in

---

[34] Hemingway, E. The Snows of Kilimanjaro. / E.Hemingway. – Oxford: Scribner; Second edition, – 2002. – p.60.
[35] Abdulla, K. A Journey into Linguistics / K. Abdulla. – Baku: Mutarjim, – 2010. – p. 16.

the 1950s.[36] Later, T.A. van Dijk conducted extensive studies on the term "discourse."[37]

The fundamental difference between discourse and text is that discourse is tied to the situational context, whereas text is more abstract. F.Y. Veysalli compared discourse and text and proposed the following distinction: "*A text is a broader linguistic unit than discourse and can consist of multiple discourses; discourse is a real speech event, while text does not express real time*."[38]

The pragmatics of discourse is influenced by reference. The pragmatic features of discourse also include the proposition. Presupposition aids in the development of thought within discourse and encompasses previously assumed ideas. The meanings conveyed by verbs are particularly significant in clarifying presupposition. For example:

"*Son zamanlar ən çox daxili işığına yandığım və əlbəttə ki, xüsusi inandığım bir cümlə barədə, Əziz Oxucu, səninlə xüsusi danışmaq istəyirəm*".[39]

"*Recently, I would like to talk to you specially, dear reader, about a sentence that I have been most drawn to for its inner light and, of course, one that I truly believe in.*" (Rzayeva A)

In this sentence, both the intensification of meaning and the clarification of presupposition are noteworthy, with specific phrases such as "*ən çox daxili işığına yandığım*" (most drawn to its inner light) and "*xüsusi danışmaq*" (to talk specially) playing crucial roles.

According to N. Enkvist, discourse is "*a unity of text and the social component of context*."[40]

---

[36] Harris, Z. Discourse Analysis: A sample text // – New York, Language, – 1952. 28, – p.1-30

[37] Dijk, T.A. van. Discourse as Structure and Process. / T.A.Dijk. – London: Saga Publication, – 1997. – 356 p.

[38] Veysalli, F.Y. Introduction to Discourse Analysis / F.Y. Veysalli. – Baku: Education NPM, – 2010. – p. 21.

[39] https://bakubookcenter.az/product/50141

[40] Enkvist, N.E. From Text to the Interpretability: A Contribution of the Discussion of Basic Terms in Text Linguistics / Convexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse / Ed. by W.Heydrich. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, – 1989. – p. 369.

In the third paragraph of Chapter II, titled **"Intra-textual Connection and Author's Intent,"** research on texts demonstrates that a common understanding can be achieved by analyzing what most linguists have stated regarding the formal and semantic structure of the text. Intra-textual connection generally occurs in two forms: explicit and implicit. Explicit connection within the text refers to the expression of a given idea through specific formal-structural means. Linguistic tools, such as cohesion, play a central role in expressing explicit connections. Implicit connection, on the other hand, implies that the content of the presented idea appears to be hidden within the text. This is because no formal tools are used to express the idea, but the reader understands the presented idea based on previously acquired background knowledge or intuition. For example:

"Adanın içlərinə doğru bir qədər də irəliləyək. Gəlin görək, dilçilik elminin qarşısında daha hansı problem durur?! Daha nəyi öyrənir dilçilik?".[41]

"*Let us move further into the concept of the island. What other challenges lie ahead for the field of linguistics? What additional areas does linguistics explore?" (Rzayeva A)*

In this syntactic unit, no explicit cohesive devices are immediately noticeable, yet the word *"ada" (island)* in the first sentence is used metaphorically to represent "the science of linguistics." The second sentence establishes a parallel relationship, with the author comparing linguistics to a vast island to enhance the readability of the literary work and appeal to the reader's aesthetic sense. Although the term "linguistics" is not explicitly mentioned in the first sentence, the second sentence logically continues and effectively explains the first.

Pragmatics necessitates speech acts that are contextually appropriate. For instance, when observing a person raising their hand, the purpose of this action—whether greeting, warning, or saying goodbye—is entirely dependent on context. These actions are realized in natural language through sentences or discourse. The appropriateness of these actions to the context depends on the situation involving the "speaker" and the "hearer." Thus, a speech act

---

[41] Abdulla, K. A Journey into Linguistics / K. Abdulla. – Baku: Mutarjim, – 2010. – p. 33.

is both *cognitive* and *social.* On the one hand, it depends on knowledge, belief, and choice, while on the other hand, it involves politeness and obligation. For example, when giving advice, it should be framed positively for the listener. In the sentence *"You better take this medicine,"* the word "better" pragmatically conveys a suggestion. Replacing *"better"* with the modal verb *"must"* alters the pragmatic implication, transforming the suggestion into advice.

At times, a speech act may prompt the reader or listener to reconsider their perspective. The author assumes this characteristic is essential for effective literary communication. Without it, the author may fail to persuade the reader, as the act of convincing demonstrates the author's expertise and knowledge. The reader, in turn, relies on the interplay of text and context. For example:

"Cənub küləkləri Xəzər dənizinin həyəcanlı qəlbini bir daha coşdururdu: dalğalar suya enmiş təyyarənin qanadları kimi sahilə hücum edirdi. Küləklər, sahil bağından söyüd ağaclarının sükutunu pozur və qızıl Bakının yaxın gələcəyindən dastanlar oxuyurdu. Dəni-zin qəlbi həyatının ikinci dövrünə təzəcə qədəm qoyan bir gəncin qəlbi kimi döyünürdü. Kiçik dalğaları qaz sürüsü kimi qabağına qatıb kişləyən rüzgarı, şabalıd rəngli mazut silsiləsini Bakı limanının ağ daşlarına çırpınırdı. Bakı görünür, xəritədən şimaldan bir nəhən-gin burnu kimi dənizin böyrünə girmiş qara nöqtə böyüməkdə idi".[42]

"*The southern winds were once again stirring the restless heart of the Caspian Sea: the waves were attacking the shore like the wings of a plane descending into the water. The winds disturbed the silence of the willows from the coastal garden and sang tales of the near future of golden Baku. The heart of the sea was beating like the heart of a young man who had just entered the second stage of life. The small waves, like a flock of geese, were crashing against the white stones of Baku harbor, driven by the chestnut-colored crude oil streaks. Baku, it seemed, was growing as a black dot on the side of the sea, like the nose of a giant entering the northern part of the map.*" *(Rzayeva A)*

---

[42] Ordubadi, M.S. Works. [In 8 Volumes] / M.S. Ordubadi. – Baku: Azernashr, – 1966. – p. 190.

The phrase *"Xəzər dənizinin qəlbi"* (*The heart of the Caspian Sea)* in the first sentence is a metaphor, while *"qızıl Bakı" (golden Baku)* is an epithet. Other sentences employ literary devices such as simile *"təyyarənin qanadları kimi", "qaz sürüsü kimi" (like the wings of an airplane," "like a flock of geese")* and metonymy *"küləklər dastan oxuyur"* (*the winds sang tales*) attributing human characteristics to inanimate objects. In the sentence *"Dənizin qəlbi həyatının ikinci dövrünə təzəcə qədəm qoyan bir gəncin qəlbi kimi döyünürdü"* (*The heart of the sea was beating like the heart of a young man just stepping into the second stage of his life)* a metaphor is used.

In Chapter III, titled **"The Characteristics of Cohesion and Informationality in Texts,"** the reciprocal relationship between cohesion and informationality in text creation is analyzed. Inter-sentential cohesion is particularly significant because it distinguishes the text from other linguistic units in various ways. According to McAllister and C. Miller, "*the text is a unity of theme and purpose, serving as a means of conveying human knowledge and cultural beliefs to the reader.*"[43] Cohesion shapes the informational structure of the text. M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan classify cohesion into grammatical and lexical types. Grammatical cohesion includes reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunction. They further divide the reference group into subcategories such as anaphora, cataphora, and exophora.[44]

Ellipsis provokes thought and engages the reader, playing a vital role in the pragmatic construction of a text. M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan identify three types of ellipsis: verb, nominal, and clausal ellipsis.[45] Sentences with nominal ellipsis often contrast with substitutions and can be completed using *"one"* or *"ones,"* depending on the omitted element's quantity. The primary feature of nominal ellipsis is the omission of nouns or nominative words, retaining preceding

---

[43] Mc Allister, J. Introductory linguistics for speech and language therapy practice. 2nd ed. / J.Mc Allister, J.Miller. – Malden MA: Wiley, – 2013. – p.255.
[44] Halliday, M.A.K. Cohesion in English. / M.A.K.Halliday, R.Hasan. – London: Longman, – 1976. – p.192.
[45] Halliday, M.A.K. Cohesion in English. / M.A.K.Halliday, R.Hasan. – London: Longman, – 1976.., p.202.

modifiers such as quantifiers, epithets, and determiners, along with deixis. For example: "*What is yours?" "Beer." "He said to Tom*."[46]

In this dialogue, several sentence elements undergo ellipsis. The possessive pronoun *"yours"* is used independently, omitting the noun that would typically follow it. Similarly, *"Beer"* is used in place of *"It is beer,"* with the subject omitted for emphasis and fluency, presenting only the nominal predicate.

In literary text formation, cohesion and informativeness play a significant role. At times, categories are not realized through explicit means but in an implicit form, wherein informativeness becomes functional. Informativeness is considered a linguistic factor, with its distinguishing and communicative properties contributing to the coherence of information. The arrangement of paragraphs in a text ensures the chain-like connection and consistency of information. For instance, if information in a paragraph is repeated, it disrupts the text's informativeness, compromising its coherence.

It was already late, and the café had emptied out, leaving only an old man sitting in the shade created by the tree's leaves under the electric light. During the day, the street was covered in dust, but at night, the dew settled it. The old man preferred to stay out late at night because he was deaf, and the quietness of the night allowed him to sense a contrast he couldn't during the day.[47]

In this paragraph, several pieces of information are conveyed in two sentences. First, the phrase *"it was late"* indicates the end of the day, specifically evening time. Subsequently, the word *"except"* informs the reader that only the old man remained. In the second sentence, the information about the man being deaf introduces new information that the reader can clearly infer.

In the first paragraph of Chapter III, titled **"Informativeness and the Author in Literary Texts,"** it is demonstrated that the primary role in organizing the content of a text lies in its informativeness. A text differs from a mere collection of words due

---

[46] Hemingway, E. The Snows of Kilimanjaro. / E.Hemingway. – Oxford: Scribner; Second edition, – 2002. – p.103.
[47] Hemingway, E. The Snows of Kilimanjaro. / E.Hemingway. – Oxford: Scribner; Second edition, – 2002. – p.96.

to its coherence and informativeness. Informativeness, in this context, refers to the text's communicative function in a globalized world. In literary texts, informativeness is regarded as one of the main factors determining their relevance. What distinguishes a text from a disjointed collection of words is its structured nature and its ability to convey targeted information. Informativeness depends on the integrity and coherence of the text. In literary works, informativeness ensures the resonance of the text with the contemporary world and underpins its relevance.

The components of a text possess both connective means and categorical relationships. In the formation of literary texts, cohesion and informativeness are critical in this regard. Occasionally, categories are realized not through explicit formal means but implicitly, at which point informativeness assumes a functional role. Generally, informativeness is considered a linguistic factor, characterized by its ability to differentiate and convey information effectively. The literary quality of texts significantly enhances their informativeness compared to non-literary texts. When a text expressed in a simple style is described in a literary and figurative manner, it becomes more expressive and informative.

"İxtilatın şirin, sözün məzəli,
Şəkər gülüşündən canlar təzəli,
Ellər yaraşığı, ölkə gözəli
Nə gözəl doğubsan anadan Pəri".[48]

The words *"məzəli" (funny)*, *"təzəli" (fresh)*, *"gözəli" (beautiful)* have a specific rhyming characteristic for couplets (goshma).

In prose, informativeness is established through cohesion, while in poetry, it is shaped by prosody. For example:

"*All eyes were on Enceladus's face,*
And they beheld, while still Hyperion's name
Flew from his lips up to the vaulted rocks,
A pallid gleam across his features stern". [49]

---

[48] Vaqif, M.P. Works / M.P. Vaqif. – Baku: "East-West", – 2004. – p. 164.
[49] Keats, John. Classical Poetry Series, poems – The World's Poetry Archive: [Electronic resource] / Poemhunter.com, – 2012. – p.96

In this text, the words *"face"* and *"name"* rhyme due to the diphthong present in both, and when the text is spoken aloud, additional alliteration of the [f] consonant can be observed.

In the second paragraph of Chapter III, titled **"The Characteristics of Cohesion in Text Creation,"** it is noted that grammatical and text-creating semantic relations interactively contribute to the formation of texts. Various cohesion devices are employed, including phonetic elements (alliteration and assonance), morphological markers (gender, tense, case), lexical repetitions, syntactic repetitions (complete and incomplete), lexical-grammatical tools (lexical cohesion, determiners, prepositions), deictics (time and place), and others. Lexical repetitions, in particular, establish various logical-semantic relationships. Occasionally, parallelisms are created through these repetitions. The formation of parallelisms involves not only lexical cohesion but also, more importantly, grammatical cohesion.

"Yay mövsümünü iki dəfə Bakıda keçirmişəm. Bilinir ki, yayda istidən evdə oturmaq çətindir, hər kəs bulvara üz tutur. Mən də digərləri kimi hər gün bulvara çıxırdım; çünki dənizin sərinliyi istinin təsirindən xilas olmaq üçün Bakıda ən əlverişli yer idi. Hər gün bulvara gəldikdə gözüm tanışlara sataşırdı ki, onlarla vaxt keçirib bir az əylənim. Axşam saatlarında qadınların çoxluğu səbəbindən nə rahat gəzmək, nə də dincəlmək mümkün olurdu. Buna görə də günorta saatlarında bulvara gedib sakit bir şəkildə gəzir, axşam isə evimə qayıdaraq istirahət edirdim. Bağlarda və ya bağçalarda gecələmək və qadınlarla vaxt keçirmək üçün artıq hövsələm də, həvəsim də qalmamışdı. Gündüzlər bulvarda rast gəldiyim insanlar əsasən mənim kimi qələm sahibləri və ya teatr xadimləri olurdu.".[50]

I have spent summer twice in Baku. Summers in Baku are notoriously hot, making it difficult to stay indoors, prompting most people to flock to the boulevard. Like many others, I would visit the boulevard daily, as the cool sea breeze provided a welcome escape from the oppressive heat. Each day, upon arriving at the boulevard, I

---

[50] Mammadguluzadeh, J. Perhaps They Returned / J. Mammadguluzadeh. – Baku: Azernashr, – 1928. – p. 43.

would encounter familiar faces with whom I would spend time and share enjoyable moments. However, the evenings presented a different challenge: the sheer number of people, particularly women, made it almost impossible to walk peacefully or relax. To avoid this, I preferred visiting the boulevard during the day, enjoying the tranquility it offered. In the evenings, I would return home to rest, lacking both the patience and desire to spend nights in parks or gardens or in the company of large crowds. The individuals I encountered during the day were often people like me - writers or theater professionals. (Rzayeva A)

In this example, all the sentences within the paragraph are interconnected, creating a sense of parallelism. The ideas the author seeks to convey are effectively completed through successive sentences.

Ellipsis is frequently employed in both languages under consideration. In the analysis of literary works, it is evident that English literary texts often exhibit a higher prevalence of verbal ellipses. This is largely because, in English syntax, sentences without a subject are typically regarded as anomalous. Even when the subject is indefinite, the formal subject "it" is used to maintain grammatical consistency. However, in literary styles, particularly in character dialogue, such sentences are occasionally observed. For instance, in the following example, the object has been omitted.

"*But when she does find me out, she makes no row at all. I sometimes wish she would; but she merely laughs at me*" [51] – (*Amma o, məni tapanda, heç bir mübahisə etmir. Mən bəzən o bunu arzulayıram; amma o, sadəcə mənə gülür*).

Ellipsis and substitute words, as devices for text creation, are closely interrelated, as ellipsis is often referred to as "zero substitution." Both mechanisms involve presupposition; however, in ellipsis, this presupposition is implicit, whereas in substitute words, it is expressed explicitly through forms such as *one*, *ones*, *do*, *have*, and *be*.

---

[51] Wilde, O. The Picture of Dorian Gray. / O.Wilde. – New York: Dover Publications, Fifth Publication, – 1993. – p.12.

In the third paragraph of Chapter III, titled **"The Role of Cohesion in the Completeness of Informativeness,"** it is demonstrated that the units forming a text can be categorized into two groups: formal and semantic. Formal units are grounded in the grammatical structure of the text and include elements such as repetitions, particles, conjunctions, prepositions, articles, determiners or descriptive words, and pronouns. On the other hand, semantic relations between text components are established through various connections, including sequential, cause-and-effect, simultaneity, enumeration, contradiction, and comparison relationships. These relationships function as the foundational meaning links in text creation.

Repetitions are utilized within texts to foster cohesion, enhance expressiveness, and increase emphasis. Authors often employ phonetic repetitions - such as assonance and alliteration - to produce rhythmic, harmonious, and rhyming effects. For example:

"*And, as his strength*
Failed him at length,
He met a pilgrim shadow–
'Shadow,' said he,
'Where can it be –
This land of Eldorado?".[52]

In this example, the repetition of the word *shadow* serves both as a text-creation device and a cohesion tool with a primary informative function.

Elliptical sentences in Azerbaijani are formed by omitting elements that are considered redundant within the sentence structure. For example:

"*– Ata, ayda on beş manat qardaşıma göndərə bilərsən? – Yox, oğul gücüm çatmaz. On manat bəlkə... Bəs sən?*".[53]

– Father, can you send my brother fifteen manat a month? – No, my son, I can't afford it. Maybe ten manat... What about you? (Rzayeva A)

---

[52] https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/48634/eldorado-56d22a0920778)
[53] Hagverdiyev, A. Selected Works / A. Hagverdiyev. – Baku: Azernashr, – 1936. – p. 190.

In this example, the repetitions carry an informative load. The omission of the subject in the first sentence and the predicate in the third and fourth sentences ensures that the remaining elements convey a greater degree of informativeness.

When comparing elliptical sentences in Azerbaijani and English, it becomes evident that the omission of the subject is more common in Azerbaijani. In English, ellipsis of the subject is relatively rare. In English literary texts, sentences with minimal information are typically replaced by the formal subject *it*. For instance:

"It was the only thing to do. If you hadn't, by now you'd be back home working trying to get enough money to get married" – *(Ediləcək yeganə iş bu idi. Sən bunu etməsəydin, indi sən evə qayıdaraq evlənmək üçün kifayət qədər pul qazanmağa çalışmalı idiniz).*

When the omitted subject in such sentences is restored, no reduction in meaning is observed. However, when the pronoun *it* functions as the formal subject, the sentence appears more impactful and informative. In Azerbaijani examples, it is clearly noticeable that when the subject is mentioned in a preceding sentence and omitted in subsequent sentences, the text retains its informativeness. For example:

"Hacı Kamyabın qapısı hər gələn üçün açıq idi. Hər il məhərrəm ayının birindən onunadək imam ehsanı verərdi".[54]

"Haji Kamyab's door was always open to everyone. Every year, from the first day of Muharram until the end, he would give a funeral repast for the Imam."

In this instance, the subject of the second sentence is omitted, but from the context, it is evident that it refers to the subject of the previous sentence - Haji Kamyab. Here, both sentences present information to the reader in a consecutive manner.

The definite article, on the other hand, conveys a distinct difference in meaning. Articles also exhibit informative qualities in various contexts: expressing units of measurement (*a pound, a minute*), indicating repeated events (*once a year, twice a month*),

---

[54] Hagverdiyev, A. Selected Works / A. Hagverdiyev. – Baku: Azernashr, – 1936. – p. 174.

generalizing proper nouns *("There isn't a single Rogers still living in our town"),* and conveying plurality. In these instances, articles contribute significantly to the reader's understanding of proper nouns and their contexts.[55]

Pronouns are particularly notable in text creation due to their universality. For example:

"*When Lord Henry entered the room, he found his uncle sitting in a rough shooting-coat, smoking a cheroot, and grumbling over The Times.*"[56]

In the text, the use of the title *Lord* preceding the name *Henry*, along with the pronouns *he* and *his* that indicate gender, serves to clarify the individual's gender within the sentence.

One of the primary cohesion devices that establish connections within texts is the use of conjunctions. In English, coordinating conjunctions include *and*, *or*, *nor*, *but*, *for*, *so*, and *yet*. For example:

"Does it make any difference whether I do or not?"/ "You're sure you wouldn't like to stay in camp with her yourself and let me go out and hunt the buffalo?"[57]

The semantic category of informativeness is closely related to the structural components of a text and its cohesion in various contexts. Cohesion, recognized as an explicit device, actively contributes to the formation of informativeness, which operates as an implicit device. Informativeness is intrinsically linked to other categories—pragmatics and presupposition - because each textual category conveys specific information. Collectively, the tools of cohesion form a complex system comprising linguistic-stylistic devices and extralinguistic factors.

The **"Conclusion"** section of the dissertation summarizes the findings of the research process. The main results are as follows:

---

[55] Wishon, G.E. Let's Write English. / G.E.Wishon, J.M.Burks. – New York: Atlantis Publishers, – 1980. – p.130.

[56] Wilde, O. The Picture of Dorian Gray. / O.Wilde. – New York: Dover Publications, Fifth Publication, – 1993. – p.57.

[57] Hemingway, E. The Snows of Kilimanjaro. / E.Hemingway. – Oxford: Scribner; Second edition, – 2002. – p.12.

1. In defining language categories, the interaction between cognitive and linguistic features is essential. Linguistic tools are consistently employed to describe cognitive events. While language serves as a means to realize categories and concepts, texts provide the platform where the language system is actualized. Real-world concepts and ideas are categorized through thought and materialized through language. The text (discourse) is the space where language is realized. Semantic categories of language manifest in word meanings, providing clear evidence of the necessity to interpret language categories in terms of their semantic aspects.

2. Changes in meaning within a language system - such as narrowing or expansion - are formed through semantic variation. Formal and semantic language categories maintain a complementary relationship. The formal-logical and abstract-content types of cohesion constitute the foundational principles of the structural-semantic organization of literary texts. Cohesion interacts with other textual categories - such as connectivity, prospection, retrospection, informativeness, intensity, and modality - in a complex and probabilistic rather than strictly regulated manner.

3. Related microtexts combine to form macrotexts, with sentences connected through logical-semantic relations (coherence) and formal-linguistic relations (cohesion). Coherence ensures the text's connectivity and integrity, linking functional, cognitive, and pragmatic perspectives. The primary criteria for textual connectivity include completeness, wholeness, integrativity, and communicativeness.

4. The primary function of cohesion in a text is to ensure connectivity between its elements and, depending on the author's intention, to establish a hierarchy among its components. This, in turn, facilitates the integration of the text and the realization of subtextual (implicit) information. The content of individual syntactic units, chapters, or sections of a work is unified into a coherent whole, with abstract-content cohesion mitigating the relative semantic independence of text segments. This process effectively "melts" these segments, subordinating them to the central theme. Consequently, the integration of text segments relies significantly on

lexical, grammatical, and logical cohesion devices. Among the various phonetic, lexical, morphological, and syntactic devices for text construction, morphological devices hold particular importance. Additionally, within the category of syntactic devices, repetitions serve as a primary text-building mechanism, functioning simultaneously as grammatical and stylistic devices.

5. The realization of cohesion is intrinsically linked to its role in the communication process, specifically the transmission of information from sender to receiver. Through cohesion, the text acquires a distinct essence, presenting information through utterances interconnected by various lexical, grammatical, and logical relations aligned with the communicative intent of the sender and receiver. A literary text functions as a cohesive and unified system of interconnected elements that collectively contribute to its composition. These elements interact through various forms of connection, correlation, and interaction, which can be classified as lexical, distant, associative, expressive, or compositional-structural cohesion.

6. Cohesion possesses a strong integrative potential, ensuring the semantic integrity of literary texts and providing the foundation for understanding the text as a unified whole. By contributing to text integration, cohesion establishes a specific space-time continuum and shapes the structure of the narrative line. Its actualization results in the creation of markers that convey additional information and connotative meanings, thereby facilitating the realization of the logical-semantic category of informativity. Informativity plays a critical role in forming a coherent text, reflecting the author's intent to communicate their ideas effectively to the reader (or listener). The constitutive categories of the text - informativity, intentionality, cohesion, and coherence - employ specific methods and means of expression.

7. Analyzing the text from a communicative perspective - viewing it as a communicative act - requires further clarification of cohesion as a concept. The diverse semantic relations reflected in the text's structure serve as manifestations of pragmatic-communicative connectivity. The semantic coherence and structural organization of a

text can only be fully understood within the context of its communicative purpose. Repeated elements, which reflect semantic and logical connections, serve not only as formal devices but also as semantic tools that unify the text.

8. The category of informativeness in literary texts is realized through a complex interplay of cognitive and discursive factors. Informativeness, representing the novelty of meaning for the reader, is a multifaceted textual category that reflects the text's ability to present information in both explicit and implicit forms. This category should be evaluated in correlation with the conceptual, linguistic, and formal-content levels of text comprehension.

9. Intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and interactivity function as subcategories of informativeness, which is the central semantic category of a text or discourse. The distribution of informativeness spans all text components, manifesting as meaningful connections in both parallel and sequential forms. In literary texts, particularly in verse composed in English and Azerbaijani, informativeness is conveyed through prosody. From a pragmatic perspective, valuable information serves as an indicator of informativeness, with its utility and significance determined by the reader.

10. Knowledge, cultural customs, and linguistic norms play a vital role in the organization, retention, and transmission of literary texts. In such texts, pragmatics - reflecting the author's intent - is a defining characteristic, with complex narration being more typical of storytelling-based compositions. Literary texts are rich in artistic expression and are inherently more expressive, emotional, and subjective than other text types. They are closely intertwined with the life, values, customs, and norms of both society and individuals.

11. Coherence is a hallmark of literary texts, supported by devices such as ellipsis or substitution, which primarily enhance expressiveness. Coherence relations, established through deixis devices, facilitate the interpretation of specific situations within the text. Frequently used conjunctions, categorized in this research as conjunctions and conjunctive words, serve as key tools in forming textual coherence. Conjunctions function as morphological devices that link intra-sentence units and connect sentences of varying

structures, establishing semantic relations. Through references, these devices clarify categories such as person, gender, case, and quantity, as well as indicators of time and space.

12. In Azerbaijani texts, the omission of the subject is widely observed, whereas English employs the formal subject "*it*" to maintain informativeness. In Azerbaijani, the subject can be omitted in subsequent sentences after its introduction in the first sentence without diminishing the text's informativeness. In English literary texts, it is more characteristic for current predicate to undergo ellipsis. In both languages, nominative sentences are generally non-informative. According to the grammatical-syntactic structure of the Azerbaijani language, expressions such as "*bəsdir," "elədir," "belədir," "düzdür,"* etc., are not only elliptical but also informative in nature. Explicit means cohesion directly participates in the creation of implicit informativeness. Furthermore, informativeness is intricately linked to pragmatics and presupposition.

The main provisions of the research are reflected in the following published scientific works of the author:

1. Mətndaxili əlaqə və müəllif niyyəti // Azərbaycan Dövlət Pedaqoji Universiteti-Doktorantların və Gənc Tədqiqatçıların XXII Respublika Elmi Konfransının materialları. – Bakı: 22-23 noyabr 2018. – s.261-263.

2. Bədii mətnlərdə koherensiya və praqmatika // Lənkəran Dövlət Universiteti, "İnteqrasiya mühitində Azərbaycan elminin qarşısında duran vəzifələr" mövzusunda gənc tədqiqatçıların (magistrant və doktorantların) Respublika Elmi konfransı. – Lənkəran: – 2018. – s.135-136.

3. Bədii mətnlərdə koheziya xüsusiyyətləri // Lənkəran Dövlət Universiteti. – Lənkəran: Elmi Xəbərlər, Humanitar Elmlər, – 2018. – s.148-153.

4. German qrup dillərində söz yaradıcılığı // Filologiya məsələləri. – Bakı: "Elm və Təhsil", – 2018. №9, – s.61-67.

5. Bədii mətnlərdə tərcümə olunmayan koheziya vasitələri // Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti, Tərcümə Problemləri, Respublika Elmi-pratik konfransının materialları. 15 mart 2019. – s.114-115.

6. Mətn və diskursun bəzi spesifik xüsusiyyətləri // Lənkəran Dövlət Universiteti, "Tədris Prosesində Elmi İnnovasiyaların Tətbiqi Yolları" mövzusunda respublika konfransının materialları. – Lənkəran: 7-8 may 2019. – 2 s.

7. The Specific Features of Literary Texts // Science and World (International scientific journal-3/67), 2019 Vol.III. – Volgograd: – 2019. – p.8-11.

8. Linguistic Analysis of a Literary Text // Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti, Dil və Ədəbiyyat, – X c. – 2020. №1, – s.62-66.

9. Nəsimi yaradıcılığında mətnyaratma vasitələrinin linqvistik təhlili // Filologiya Məsələləri. – Bakı: "Elm və Təhsil", – 2021. №2, – s.213-220.

10. Dil kateqoriyalarına struktur yanaşma // Bakı Slavyan Universiteti. Humanitar elmlərin öyrənilməsinin aktual problemləri, 1/2021, – s.68-74.

11. Dil kateqoriyalarına semantik yanaşma // Elmi iş (beynəlxalq elmi jurnal), tezislər toplusu, – Bakı: – 2021. – s.25-27.

12. Comparative-typology and comparative-historical linguistics informativity of English texts // Modern Movement of Science: abstracts of the 12th International Scientific and Practical Internet Conference, April 1-2, 2021. – Dnipro, Ukraine, 2021. – P.1.– p.178.

13. The Power of Cohesion: Unlocking Informativity in Texts // Path of Science: International Electronic Scientific Journal. – Vol 9, – Slovak Republic: – 2023. No8, – p.8012-8017.

14. Text Research from a Pragmatic Perspective (Abstract) ICPL 2024, The 4th International Conference on the Philosophy of Language, Literature, and Linguistics, 9-11 May 2024 Manisa, Turkiye.

The defence will be held on 15 April 2025 at 13:00 at the meeting of the Dissertation Council ED 1.06, operating under the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi, within the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences and under the Higher Attestation Commission of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, is constituted as the BFD 1.06 Ad hoc Dissertation Council.

Address: Baku, AZ 1143, H. Javid Avenue 115, 5th Floor, Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi, ANAS.

The dissertation is accessible at the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi of the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences Library.

Electronic versions of the abstract is available on the official website of the Institute of Linguistics named after Nasimi of the Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences

Abstract was sent to the required addresses on 19 February 2025.