

Hopefully, the present investigation has shown some cognitive facets of the phenomenon analyzed, proving that foregrounding may be form and content motivated. Either of such motivated emphasis or a combination of both can result in paronymous attraction, i.e. intentional colliding verbal units of similar form but different meaning, aimed at producing an utterance which sounds fresh and expressive. Eventually, in case the result is a communicative success, the additional intellectual effort made by the addressee upon inferring the new information brings him considerable additional intellectual pleasure. Concluding the present paper, we cannot but agree with E. Kubryakova's thesis that foregrounding activates not only knowledge, but opinions, intentions and emotions as well.

## **AUTHOR'S INTENTION THROUGH REPETITION**

**Irina V. Sokolova**  
*Ukrainian Academy of Business*  
*Sumy, Ukraine*

Text and discourse studies have become one of the most popular branches of contemporary linguistics. Linguists' attention is drawn to text-forming factors, from which the author's intention goes to the forefront. The choice of lexical, grammatical, syntactic and other media in the process of text-formation is governed by the author's intention. The author's intention is to a great extent realized through different types of repetition. It is interesting to observe the function of intentional repetition in the text-prefaces (TP) to special scientific texts, where the author's intention is made explicit. The author directly appeals to certain circles of readers in order to present information about the book that follows as well as to advertise it.

Different authors choose individual creative types of repetition, but it is noticed that in TP there is a tendency towards the frequent use of lexical repetition. Lexical repetition of terms and nomenclature words, together with morphemic repetition (mostly of root-words), takes part in forming topic-chains of the text. These types of repetition aim at achieving the highest degree of precision, lucidity and abstraction, which is typical of scientific prose.

To meet the demand of pragmatic effectiveness of the text, authors use syntactic repetition, i.e. repetition of members of a sentence, parts of paragraphs or parallel constructions. The use of syntactic repetition promotes organization of the information presented in TP, contributes to logical sequence, coherence and completeness of the statement. Authors prefer to use syntactic repetition for summing up, conclusions, and accentuation of important items.

Synonymic repetition is not typical of most TP. Synonymic repetition here is presented mostly by language synonyms and is used not for emphasis but for keeping the recipient's attention on the object of communication. The usage of synonymic repetition, however, enriches the author's speech, creating his/her individual style of writing.

The choice of repetition is regulated, on the one hand, by the purposes of the text, and on the other hand, by the idiosyncrasy of the author in question. These factors correlate and work together. The author's aim is to influence the reader's mind and he/she chooses a certain type of repetition due to linguistic and anthropological factors. Hence, differences are observed in the selection of lexical, morphemic, synonymic and syntactic means, which results in expressiveness of the author's speech.

Repetitions are polyfunction<sup>^</sup> as they take part in extending topic-chains of the text by promoting its coherence and integrity. Repetitions aim at logical emphasis, which is necessary to fix the attention of the reader on the key-word of the utterance. Numerous repetitions within the sentence, in adjoining sentences and within the whole text make the main theme work and so promote the author's intention.

Sokolova, I. V. Author's Intention Through Repetition [Text] / I. V. Sokolova // Cognitive / Communicative Aspects of English: Abstracts, 27-29 May, 1999. - Cherkasy : CSU. - P. 66-67.

## **DISCOURSE MARKERS AND THEIR SYNTACTIC POSITION IN APHORISTIC SENTENCES**

**Nataliya O. Dyachuk**  
*Ivan Franko State University,*  
*Lviv, Ukraine*

The last two decades in linguistics have seen a considerable growth of interest in discourse analysis - "the study of how stretches of language take on meaning, purpose, and unity for their users" (Cook 1994). A substantial proportion of this interest has focused upon the discourse of literature. This is appropriately so, for discourse analysis must be able to account for all types of discourse, and among discourse types, literature is widely if not universally considered to be one of the most important and most powerful. This paper is aimed at the description of the discourse markers, or logical connectors and the role they play in aphoristic sentences from syntactic, functional and semantic perspectives.

One starting point for scientific analysis of written discourse is to consider the possibility that there are, in texts, rules and constraints on selection and ordering of elements above the sentence - in other words, to consider whether grammar can be extended upwards. This was frequently a major concern of early attempts at discourse analysis (Harris 1951) and of text linguistics.

There exists an assumption that ordering rules for sentences can be formulated for narratives, but this formulation can not be generalized to other discourse types. But there are many other principles governing the ordering of events especially in literature, and indeed, as Fleischman (1993) observes, the frequent assumption in linguistics that chronological sequencing of events in narrative is usually in expected order may well be wrong. Thus, a clear comprehension of discourse markers that signal relationships among ideas as expressed through phrases, clauses, and sentences can greatly enhance reading efficiency.

In this investigation, I will consider logical connectors - words or phrases whose function is to show some logical relationships between two or more basic sentences composing an aphoristic utterance. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), conjunctions and correlatives have as much a syntactic as a semantic function and serve to coordinate clauses within a surface structure sentence; logical connectors have primarily a semantic, cohesive function, which holds within or between surface structure sentences.

Typically, logical connectors are presented according to the function they fulfill. There exist a number of hierarchies of functional categories that logical connectors could encounter in a discourse widely described in theoretical works by Downing (1995), Mackay (1987), Secord (1978), Halliday and Hasan (1976). Equally well, there exists a wide variety of words and phrases with precisely the same function. Robin Macpherson (1996) defines their eight functional categories: "discourse markers that emphasize and/or enumerate *{above all,*