DOI: 10.31648/pw.11464

Anatolii Zahnitko
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7398-6091
Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University in Ukraine
Viktoriia Andrushchenko
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3913-6947
Donbas State Pedagogical University in Ukraine

FICTIVE CONVERSATIONAL COHESIVE PATTERNS OF THE CATEGORY OF THE ADDRESSER IN THE UKRAINIAN LITERARY TEXT

Abstract: This study explores how the category of the addresser manifests itself at the communicative level through the use of fictive conversational cohesive patterns. A literary text has been viewed from a communicative perspective as a dialogue – a conversation between an addresser and an addressee. The category of the addresser is treated as a linguistic-social communicative category, expressed by linguistic means which coherence and cohesion establish. These means aid the addressee in perceiving and understanding the global macrosense (integrity) of a literary text as an informational whole, while also analyzing its microsenses within its supra-phrasal unities (segmentation).

Keywords: a literary text, fictive conversational cohesive patterns, the category of coherence, the category of the addresser, the category of the addressee

Introduction

A literary text has always been analysed from the perspective of a structural, semantic, socio-communicative and pragmatic approaches. However, the study of a text as a conversation between an addresser and an addressee with focus on the category of the addresser, its grammatical expression and interrelation with the other text categories within a text whole needs further discussion and clarification.

A text is defined as a communicative occurrence if it meets seven standards of textuality. The standards of textuality which are set forth in are all relational in character, concerned with how occurrences are connected to others: via grammatical dependencies on the surface (cohesion); via conceptual dependencies in the textual world (coherence); via the attitudes of the participants toward the text (intentionality and acceptability); via the incorporation of the new and unexpected into the known and expected (informativity); via the setting (situationality);

and via the mutual relevance of separate texts (intertextuality) (Halliday | Webster 2002, 3). If any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative.

In this paper we regard the category of the addresser as a linguistic-social (Zahnitko)[1] communicative category, which being expressed by language tools of the coherence (coherence | cohesion) category manifestation, stimulates a recipient's perception and awareness of the global macrosense (integrity) of a literary informatively complete text continuum whilst analysing its microsenses within supra-phrasal unities (segmentation). This view justifies the choice of the unit of our analysis – a supra-phrasal unity (SPU).

To our mind, it is the category of the addresser which interrelates with the category of intentionality and reveals the addresser's intention to convey an informative (theme – rheme) text message to the addressee, whereas the category of the addressee expresses the acceptability by the latter of an informative (theme – rheme) text message delivered by the addresser (Andrushchenko 2023, 55).

So, we consider the category of the addresser in correlation with the category of intentionality (the addresser's intention, motive) as a communicative category which is formalized by formal, semantic and communicative means of the coherence (coherence | cohesion) category realization within a supra-phrasal unity as a micro-structure of a text whole.

The object of the research is a literary text communicative organization (in the Ukrainian fantasy novel *Honykhmarnyk* by D. Korniy).

The subject of the study is the category of the addresser and its representation by the communicative language markers by which the category of coherence (coherence / cohesion) manifests itself, i.e. fictive conversational cohesive patterns, within the analysed text continuum.

To figure out the outlined problem, it is reasonable to apply structural and functional methods which allow to explore a communicative nature of a literary text (within its SPUs) by the analysis of the category of the addresser and its language expression at the communicative level.

Systemic sampling method makes it possible to extract from the analysed text continuum supra-phrasal unities which contain conversational cohesive patterns.

---

[1] The scholar ascertains that the status role of an addressee-linguoperson (the category of the addresser) is supposed to be core for text linguistic and social development, since it is the author who relates text to his own communicative tasks, embodies situational motivations in it, recognises himself by reflecting his emotional state as well as predicts a reader's reactive capacity (Zahnitko 2022, 155).

1. A literary text as a conversation between an addresser and an addressee

The central function of natural language is communication, i.e. the transmission of information (meaning) by a word, a sentence, sentences or contexts in regard with communicative organization and due to intimate relation of language and interaction. Hence, communication brings into play two modalities of interaction and textualization (Taylor 1999, 23).

M. O'Donnell describes the factors conditioning our interactional choices as "context" – the context of situation of a text / interaction, and the context of text (or context of interaction) (1999, 64-65). The latter predetermines a certain selection of language markers made by a speaker or an addresser to convey the main message of the utterance.

Consequently, any word in a sentence, sentence itself or a number of utterances determine a conversation as a form of verbal communication. This is crucial, since sequential turn-taking, as in ordinary conversation, is where the meaning of utterances unfolds, where they become intelligible and coherent to us. Conversational structures in text and discourse are processes of creating and sharing of meaning between two participants (Pascual 2014, 7).

Text is a complex and dynamic process by which a reader makes a coherent representation of the meaning (Boscolo | Mason 2003, 127). To understand a text, readers have to create a coherent mental representation in which text segments are related to each other.

Conversational analysis is a growing field of inquiry which during the last decades has been enriched by the need of a deeper understanding of the functioning of verbal signs in human cooperative processes (Gumperz 1982, 3), namely, certain semantic (true) meanings which are attached to these verbal signs (linguistic units).

For instance, A. Kiklewicz reasonably interprets such true meanings as "the consistency of the lexical, i.e. coded meaning in regard with the form and structure of the linguistic unit, with the concept as a category of mind, knowledge about objects and states of the reality around us […] Human knowledge is not only objective, but also partially subjective, truth in the linguistic nomination also means the compatibility of the concepts we cultivate with our experience, empirical perception and cultural background" (2017, 224).

Semantic analysis should properly concentrate on the study of speech acts, seen as units of human action. Some linguists have begun to focus on grammatical and semantic signals of textual cohesion and on the role of interpretive frames, scripts or schemata in understanding discourse (Fillmore 1977; Schank | Abelson 1977; Spiro | Bruce | Brewer 1980). As a result, the scholars have created a new tradition of conversational analysis which concentrates directly on verbal strategies

of speaker / listener coordination as revealed in turn taking and other practices of conversational management (Gumperz 1982, 4).

E. Pascual, in her turn, states that at the textual level we may also use the pattern of the conversation as a means to organize or present information. In oral and written discourse, narrators often use discourse-organizing questions (e.g. "Why? Because…") as well as actual or imaginative quotations as a means to present what happened. These rhetorical devices are regarded as phenomena of restricted scope – typical of contemporary public discourse (Fairclough 2003). Again, without getting into issues of occurrence frequencies over time, Pascual's claim is that the prevalence of conversation in our everyday social and mental lives is reproduced in spoken and written narratives – probably to be encountered in all cultures and at all times (2014, 6).

For that reason, cohesive devices of various kinds can be seen as clues as to where a reader's questions are being answered. It is easier to make sense of a text if the intertextual connections are recognised (Hoey 2000, 50). The objective of the writers is to have an effect on their readers using their text what leads to a vigorous branch of text linguistics – critical discourse analysis.

The analysis of text in terms of cohesive devices was pioneered by M. Halliday and R. Hasan (1976). It is sufficient to note that the coherence of a text is reflected in and signalled by the cohesion in the text. S. Tanskanen (2006) argues that cohesion is a strategy used by writers to help readers create coherence from the text: a type of signalling, in other words.

As follows, we consider the category of the addresser to be linguistically and strategically verbalized by certain cohesive patterns which the category of coherence (coherence / cohesion) provides at the communicative level and which the addresser selects to converse with the addressee in order to achieve the most desirable outcome of this communicative interaction, i.e. the addressee's comprehension and interpretation of the addresser's meaningful message.

2. The notion of fictivity and fictive interaction

Pascual regards fictive interaction as the use of the conversation, a frame to structure mental, discursive, and linguistic processes. Fictive interaction may partially serve as a model for: (i) thought, (ii) the conceptualization of experience (e.g. metaphors), (iii) discourse organization (e.g. overt monologues structured as dialogues), and (iv) the language system and its use (e.g. rhetorical questions) (2014, 9). The phenomenon like fictive interaction may also indicate the existence of some sort of correspondence between form and interactional function.

By this, the researcher examines cases in which the communicative and interactive dimensions of language become essential for understanding the basic

conceptual mechanisms underlying given conceptualizations, discourses, metaphors, and grammatical as well as pragmatic categories.

Various types of fictivity have been studied so far: (i) fictive entities and events (Langacker 1999; Talmy 2000), (ii) fictive motion (Matlock 2004; Richardson | Matlock 2007; Talmy 2000), (iii) fictive change (Matsumoto 1996; Sweetser 1990), and (iv) fictive speech acts (Langacker 1999) with an accent on the conversation frame to present information structure and relations between sentences or clauses.

The type of fictive interaction set up may be used to make mental contact with and highlight: (i) the fictive dialogue itself, (ii) its fictive addressee, or (iii) its fictive speaker (Pascual 2014, 56).

3. The classification of fictive conversational cohesive patterns

Respectively to types of fictive interaction (Pascual 2014, 9), we will distinguish question-answer relations: i) interrogative questions as exclamations, ii) rhetoric questions, iii) wh-questions, iv) internal monologues as dialogues etc.

The focus here is on the grammaticalized question-answer pattern, which is a prototypical conversational structure, as it represents the interchange of the speaker and hearer roles. The speaker asking a question takes the role of hearer when the interlocutor (i.e. the first hearer) answers this question in the next turn (Pascual 2014, 31). The same may be ascertained about the interchange of the addresser and addressee roles within text discourse.

In a large number of unrelated languages from around the world, a clearly conversational structure involving a fictive question-answer exchange has become grammaticalized to mark information structure and conditionality.

B. Heine and T. Kuteva (2002) identify wh-questions as one of the most common sources for relative markers in the languages of the world. A rhetorical interrogative element has been recognised as the source for relative markers. These fictive question-answer patterns provide an interactional basis for discourse relations.

Interrogative structures can be introduced to present strong assertions, expressing such intense conviction that the addressee or audience is expected to be totally convinced about the appropriate reply. Rhetorical questions are thus regarded as another case of fictive speech acts (Pascual 2014, 40). Example 1:

(1) Кажан розуміє – він знайшов її. Ту, кого Майстер називав Маргаритою, Орфей Еврідикою, Амур Психеєю. Але він осоружний для неї, покруч. Як із цим тепер жити? Хлопець задихається. (Korniy 2010, 111)
[Kazhan understands – he found her. The one, whom Master called Margarita, Orpheus Eurydice, Cupid Psyche. But he is disgusting for her, a werewolf. How to live with this now? The boy is suffocating.]

The category of the addresser in this SPU is introduced by an interrogative rhetoric question *Як із цим тепер жити?* 'How to live with this now?' to intensify Kazhan's fear of his feelings and love, as a werewolf, to Alina, his love which he compares with the great loves of Master and Margarita, Orpheus and Eurydice, Cupid and Psyche. What is more, the formal, semantic and communicative cohesive ties within this SPU are enhanced by intertextuality[2] and reminiscence to the worldwide famous masterpieces of literature and art.

The other ways of communicative manifestation of the category of the addresser may be specified as i) fictive conditionals, ii) fictive lies, iii) fictive assertions, iv) fictive commands, v) fictive excuses, vi) fictive apologies, vii) fictive memories etc. (Pascual 2014, 40-43). Example 2:

(2) – Іринко, не хочеш потримати на повідку небо? – мов грім, лунає запитання. "Звичайно, ні!" – підказує здоровий глузд, а уста наперекір промовляють:
– Хочу!
– Тоді роздягайся! Знімай із себе все до нитки, навіть натільний хрестик! (Korniy 2010, 37)
[– Irynka, would you like to keep the sky on a lead? – a question sounds like a thunder.
"Of course not!" – suggests her common sense, and the mouth contradicts:
– I would like to!
– Then undress! Take off everything down to the thread, even the body cross!]

The formal, semantic and communicative integrity of this SPU is determined by fictive conversational cohesive patterns of command expressed by the imperative sentences: *Тоді роздягайся!* 'Then undress!'; *Знімай із себе все до нитки* 'Take off everything down to the thread' which enhance the tension and emotiveness of the dialogue between Iryna and Honykhmarnyk. The latter demands from Iryna to remove her cross from the breast that might weaken Iryna's highest protection as an Orthodox Christian from the Dark Forces who Honykhmarnyk belongs to. Example 3:

(3) – Юрку, допоможи нам. Ти вже один раз допоміг!
– Я не допомагав.
– Як не допомагав? Сьогодні вночі.
– Я не допомагав! – з притиском говорить Юрко. – Ти сама все зробила. Я лишень
спостерігав і пильнував, щоб інші не втручалися. (Korniy 2010, 140)

[2] The term intertextuality appears to have been coined by J. Kristeva (1980), and has been used to describe a wide range of relationships that may hold between discourses. G. Genette (1982) talks of "transtextuality", reserving the term "intertextuality" for exact quotation of one text within another.

[– Yurka, help us. You already helped once!
– I didn't help.
– Didn't you help? Tonight.
– I didn't help! – says Yurka with pressure. – You did everything yourself. I was just watching to make sure the others were not interfering.]

In the above dialogical SPU, the category of the addresser is structurally, semantically and communicatively expressed by a fictive conversational cohesive pattern of command: *Юрку, допоможи нам* 'Yurka, help us', an alternation of fictive conversational cohesive patterns of assertion and question: *Я не допомагав* 'I didn't help'; *Як не допомагав?* 'Didn't you help?'; *Я не допомогав!* 'I didn't help!'. The repetition of these syntactic parallel constructions brings an understanding to the addressee that Alina, possessing her super power of witchcraft, was strong enough to win that creature which Alina's sweetheart Sashka was sharing his body with.

Metaphor and metonymy are regarded to be other strong fictive conversational cohesive patterns, whereas they play a crucial role in the production and interpretation of fictive interaction constituents (Pascual 2014, 65). Example 4:

(4) Кажан сміявся, тихесенько, ледве чутно хихотів. Аліна сердито блиснула своїми блакитними очима, розвернулася й перед тим, як вибігти з кафе, роздратовано випалила:
– Приємного дня, друже!
Вона вже не чула слів хлопця, котрі полетіли їй вслід:
– Клітка йде шукати пташку. (Korniy 2010, 18)
[Kazhan laughed, chuckled softly, barely audible. Alina glared at him with her blue eyes, turned around and, before running out of the cafe, blurted out irritably:
– Have a nice day, friend!
She no longer heard the boy's words, which flew after her:
– The cage is going to look for the bird.]

Here, the line *Клітка йде шукати пташку* 'The cage is going to look for the bird' communicatively unites the components of this SPU and metaphorically embodies the future relationships between Alina and Kazhan and the way in which they will further be developing: Alina is a free, independent bird, though, by falling in love with Kazhan, she will soon be imprisoned in his cage, i.e. his sincere love to her. By this metaphor, the addresser communicatively and informatively enriches the rendered message and makes an accent on a lasting bond which is being built between young people.

Relations between participants of conversation are based on the resources of appraisal (Hood 2004; 2010; Martin 2001; Martin | Rose 2007; Martin | White

2005) and attitude, either positive or negative, i.e. the ways in which writers and speakers evaluatively position themselves in relation to others, what they believe, how they feel, and what they believe that they know.

To these evaluative markers of appraisal and attitude we will refer the following fictive conversational cohesive patterns: 1) direct / indirect speech compounds (quotations) which present an individual, action, mental (emotional) world (feeling, mood, attitude, principle, desire, intention, attempt, reason, purpose etc.); 2) direct / indirect discourse particles, vocatives, interjections, conjunctions, interactional words, truncations or unfinished sentences or clauses etc. which often make text continuum dramatic and emotionally loaded; 3) direct / indirect deictic tense, deictic pronouns and deictic demonstratives which characterize temporal and spatial axes of a fictive interaction (Pascual 2014). In one word, these are all the language components which may occur within both direct and indirect speech literary discourse. Example 5:

(5) Не мели дурниць, Сашко! Не все так однозначно, друже! Ти надто високої думки про себе. Теж мені – нечистий! Це звання також заслужити треба. Алінко, я тебе кохаю! – шепочуть губи. – Я кохаю тебе, Алінко! Кохаю! З того першого дня і до скону! (Korniy 2010, 131)
[Don't be silly, Sashka! It is not that easy, my friend! You think too highly of yourself. You are not evil at all! This title must also be won. Alinka, I love you! – lips whisper. – I love you, Alinka! I love! From that first day to the end!]

The direct speech discourse vocatives *Сашко* 'Sashka', *друже* 'friend', *Алінко* 'Alinka' together with the grammatical cohesive repetition of syntactic parallel construction *Я кохаю тебе* 'I love you' in the analysed SPU provide its structural, semantic and communicative organization intensifying the dramatic moment of Sashka and Alinka's love confession to each other and Alina's confirmation that she does not mind having a two-spirit (half-human, half-creature) sweetheart.

The novel under analysis is based on the collision of good and evil. Alina personifies good. Honykhmarnyk (who lives in Sashka's body) – evil. The hatred which Alina feels to Honykhmarnyk is expressed by negative connotative lexemes: *у чорному* 'in black', *з двома личинами* 'with two looks', *небезпечний сусід* 'a dangerous neighbour' (Korniy 2010, 61-62); […] *навіть гірше від покруча чи яничара* '[…] even worse than a werewolf or a janissary' (Korniy 2010, 89) etc.

Honykhmarnyk also hates Alina, but his hatred is more to deal with respect for her strength, admiration for her wittiness and fear of her power that is witnessed by positive evaluative lexemes: *мов ангел у зеленому вінку з її волосся* 'like an angel in a green wreath of her hair' (Korniy 2010, 110); […] *Левиця, дика і небезпечна* '[…] a Lioness, wild and dangerous' (Korniy 2010, 120); *у ній забагато світла* 'she has a lot of light' (Korniy 2010, 131); *Скільки ж у ній сили, справжньої* 'How much real strength she has' (Korniy 2010, 132).

In addition, the communicative event set up by fictive interaction compounds is retrievable and can be made sense of through accessing: (i) cultural, (ii) historical knowledge, (iii) social and everyday life knowledge, or (iv) knowledge of the ongoing discourse in the here and now (Janssen 2007, 376-379).

Hence, some other fictive conversational patterns may be viewed in cultural perspective, since language was embedded in the life and culture of its speakers, thus, the work of art (text), as all other social discourses, enters into interaction with culture that produces a communicative semantic meaning. Culture is defined as a context for a language which expresses the mental life, social reality and experience of its speakers, whereas language is considered as a system with its grammar structures (Halliday 1999, 5-6).

Under these fictive conversational cohesive patterns, we will distinguish culture specific words (cultural realities, cultural terms) which reveal the addresser's cultural background.

Cultural related terms are designated by different names such as cultural terms, culture specific items, culture markers, cultural references, cultural bound items and realia. These embody various material items like food, clothes, currency, cultural notions like customs, institutions and proper names, names of persons, animals, locations and traditional celebrations (Mansoor et al. 2016, 44). Example 6:

(6) Аліна сидить у вікні University of the Arts, London, у ногах валяється тайстра. Звичний наплечник вона у Лондоні замінила тайстрою. Минув майже рік, як вона тут. Якось воно так вийшло зовсім поступово, тут на чужині просто зі всіх дір полізла її українськість. Тайстра замість звичного наплічника. Сорочки оздоблені вишивкою, навіть джинси, і ті з орнаментами, літні футболки з писанками […]! (Korniy 2010, 158)
[Alina is sitting in the window of the University of the Arts, London, with a taistra lying at her feet. In London, she replaced the usual backpack with a taistra. It's been almost a year since she was here. Somehow it turned out that way quite gradually, here in a foreign country, her Ukrainian identity was simply crawling out of her. Taistra instead of the usual backpack. Shirts are decorated with embroidery, even jeans, and those with ornaments, summer T-shirts with Easter eggs [...]!]

The structural, semantic and communicative integrity between the components within this SPU is predetermined by the thematic cohesive repetition of culturally related notions (*майстра* 'taistra', *вишивкою* 'embroidery', *орнаментами* 'ornaments', *з писанками* 'Easter eggs') – the symbols of Ukrainian culture – to mark the concept *українськість* 'Ukrainian identity' which is both the author's and Alina's origin.

Conclusion

In our study we identified and qualified the communicative tools of the category of the addresser representation by fictive conversational cohesive patterns which the category of coherence (cohesion / coherence) establishes within literary texts among which there are question-answer relations (interrogative questions as exclamations, rhetoric questions, wh-questions, internal monologues as dialogues etc.); fictive conditionals (lies, assertions, commands, excuses, apologies, memories etc.); metaphor and metonymy; evaluative markers of appraisal and attitude (direct / indirect speech compounds; direct | indirect discourse particles, vocatives, interjections, conjunctions etc.; direct / indirect deictic tense, deictic pronouns and demonstratives); culture specific words etc.

These outlined fictive conversational cohesive patterns of the category of the addresser and its expression at the communicative level, on the one hand, provide a structural, semantic and communicative integrity of the constituents within the text continuum and, on the other hand, facilitate an effective interaction and productive interchange of mental processes and representations between the addresser and the addressee.

The perspective of the study is to trace the category of the addresser in its interrelation with the rest communicative categories: the category of the addressee, intentionality, intertextuality and informativity which will help gain a better understanding of fictive communicative relations within a literary discourse.

References

Andrushchenko, V. (2023), The Literary Text in Aspect of Its Communicative Structure: A Theoretical Perspective, [in:] Linguistic Studies 45, 54-62.

Boscolo, P. | Mason, L. (2003), Topic Knowledge, Text Coherence, and Interest: How They Interact in Learning From Instructional Texts, [in:] The Journal of Experimental Education 71 (2), 126-148.

Fairclough, N. (2003), Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. London.

Fillmore, Ch. (1977), Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language, [in:] Harnad, S. | Stecklis, H. | Lancaster, J. (eds.), Origin and Evolution of Language and Speech. New York, 20-32.

Genette, G. (1982), Figures of Literary Discourse. New York.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982), Discourse Strategies. London.

Halliday, M. (1999), The Notion of "Context" in Language Education, [in:] Ghadessy, M. (ed.), Text and Context in Functional Linguistics. Philadelphia | Amsterdam, 1-24.

Halliday, M. | Hasan, R. (1976), Cohesion in English. London.

Halliday, M. | Webster, J. (2002), Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse. London.

Heine, B. | Kuteva, T. (2002), World Lexicon of Grammaticalization. London.

Hoey, M. (2000), Textual Interaction: An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis. London.

Hood, S. (2004), Managing Attitude in Undergraduate Writing: A Focus on the Introductions to Research Papers, [in:] Ravelli, L. | Ellis, R. (eds.), Analysing Academic Writing: Contextualised Frameworks. London, 24-44.

Hood, S. (2010), Appraising Research: Evaluation in Academic Writing. London.
Janssen, Th. (2007), A Speaker / Hearer-Based Grammar: The Case of Possessives and Compounds, [in:] Hannay, M. | Steen, G. (eds.), Structural-Functional Studies in English Grammar. Philadelphia | Amsterdam, 353-387.
Kiklewicz, A. (2017), Znaczenie a prawda: fantomy semantyczne. Olsztyn.
Korniy, D. (2010), Honykhmarnyk. Kharkiv. [Корній, Д. (2010), Гонихмарник. Харків.]
Kristeva, J. (1980), Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. New York.
Langacker, R. W. (1999), Virtual reality, [in:] Studies in Linguistic Sciences 29 (2), 77-103.
Mansoor, S. | Bari Khan, A. | Zuhra, S. | Kamran, S. | Arif, Z. (2016), A Descriptive Study of Culture Related Terms in Translation of Harry Potter Novel from English to Urdu language, [in:] Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research 4 (2), 44-50.
Martin, J. (2001), Language, register and genre, [in:] Burns, A. | Coffin, C. (eds.), Analysing English in a Global Context. London, 149-166.
Martin, J. | Rose, D. (2007), Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause. London.
Martin, J. | White, P. (2005), The Language of Education: Appraisal in English. London.
Matlock, T. (2004), Fictive Motion as Cognitive Simulation, [in:] Memory & Cognition 32, 1389-1400.
Matsumoto, Y. (1996), How Abstract is Subjective Motion? A Comparison of Coverage Path Expressions and Access Path Expressions, [in:] Goldberg, A. (ed.), Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language. Stanford, 359-373.
O'donnell, M. (1999), Context in Dynamic Modelling, [in:] Ghadessy, M. (ed.), Text and Context in Functional Linguistics. Philadelphia | Amsterdam, 63-99.
Pascual, E. (2014), Fictive Interaction: The Conversation Frame in Thought, Language, and Discourse. Philadelphia | Amsterdam.
Richardson, D. | Matlock, T. (2007), The Integration of Figurative Language and Static Depictions: An Eye Movement Study of Fictive Motion, [in:] Cognition 102, 129-138.
Schank, R. | Abelson, R. (1977), Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding. New York.
Spiro, R. J. | Bruce, B. C. | Brewer, W. F. (1980), Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension. London.
Sweetser, E. (1990), Role and Individual Readings of Change Predicates, [in:] Nuyts, J. | Peterson, E. (eds.), Language and Conceptualization. Oxford, 116-136.
Talmy, L. (2000), Towards a Cognitive Semantics: Concept Structuring Systems. Cambridge.
Tanskanen, S. (2006), Collaborating Towards Coherence. Amsterdam.
Taylor, J. (1999), What is "Organizational Communication"? Communication as a Dialogic of Text and Conversation, [in:] The Communicative Review 3 (1-2), 21-63.
Zahnitko, A. (2022), Hramatyka tekstu: movnosotsiumni katehoriyi, [in:] Zapysky z ukrayins'koho movoznavstva 29, 149-164. [Загнітко, А. (2022), Граматика тексту: мовносоціумні категорії, [in:] Записки з українського мовознавства 29, 149-164.]