

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2020.23.3.14>

К ВОПРОСУ О ВЛИЯНИИ ВЫБОРА СРЕДСТВ СВЯЗИ НА ПРОЦЕСС СТРУКТУРИРОВАНИЯ ПОДЧИНИТЕЛЬНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ В СЛОЖНОМ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИИ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ РУССКОГО И НЕМЕЦКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ)

Научная статья

Скребова Е.Г.^{1*}, Павлова Ю.Е.², Сидорова Н.В.³

^{1,2,3} Военный учебно-научный центр Военно-воздушных сил «Военно-воздушная академия имени профессора Н.Е. Жуковского и Ю.А. Гагарина», Воронеж, Россия

* Корреспондирующий автор (dolgorukaja1[at]rambler.ru)

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается влияние выбора средств связи на структурирование подчинительных отношений в сложном предложении. Актуальность обозначенной проблематики определяется возрастающим интересом исследователей к процессам выбора средств связи компонентов речевых высказываний с подчинением, основывающихся на учете особенностей речемыслительной деятельности языковой личности. Цель исследования состоит в установлении степени влияния средств связи на категоризационно-интерпретационные процессы речемыслительной деятельности языковой личности, в результате которых она порождает подчинительную конструкцию определенного типа. Материалом исследования служат сложноподчиненные предложения из художественных произведений русских и немецких писателей XX века.

Ключевые слова: внеантропологическое онтологическое событие, концепт ДЕТЕРМИНИЗМ, средства связи, направление иерархии влияний, системно-принудительно линейное развертывание компонентов.

TO THE QUESTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF LINKING LANGUAGE MEANS ON SUBORDINATE RELATIONS STRUCTURING IN A COMPLEX SENTENCE (BASED ON THE MATERIAL OF THE RUSSIAN AND GERMAN LANGUAGES)

Research article

Skrebova E.G.^{1*}, Pavlova Y.E.², Sidorova N.V.³

^{1,2,3} Russian Air Force Military Educational and Scientific Center «Air Force Academy Professor N.E. Zhukovsky and Major Y.A. Gagarin», Voronezh, Russia

* Corresponding author (dolgorukaja1[at]rambler.ru)

Abstract

The article considers the influence of linking language means on the structuring of subordinate relations in a complex sentence. The relevance of this problem is determined by the growing interest of researchers to the processes of choosing the linking means between components of an utterance with subordination taking into account some features of speech-thinking activity of a linguistic personality. The purpose of the research is to determine the degree of influence of the linking means on the categorization and interpretation processes of speech-thinking activity of a linguistic personality, which results in the generation of a certain type subordinate construction. The analyzed material is presented by complex sentences from the books of some Russian and German writers of the XX century.

Keywords: extra-anthropological ontological event, the DETERMINISM concept, linking means, the hierarchy influences direction, system-forced linear components deployment.

Introduction

The data obtained during the last decades indicate that the speech production is not so much «the performance of a language symphony» [12, P. 41], as it is the «execution of thought» represented by the language [6, P. 3]. This is a complex multiphase transformation of the totality of figurative-semantic elements in the consciousness of a linguistic personality into a certain statement structure, mediated by an internal program, some kind of extra-anthropological ontological event [3, P. 104], [4, P. 358-359], [5, P. 87-88], [6, P. 5].

Originated as a meaningful and conceptual expediency of the linguistic personality the cognitive system at the preverbal stage of producing an utterance, subordination receives syntactic implementation in the structure of an utterance, within which the units of the lexical-grammatical level are arranged in the order determined by their role and degree of participation in the fixed non-anthropological ontological event or a number of extra-anthropological ontological events (compare the opinion [1, P. 33], [7, P. 107-108]). It is necessary to point out one important detail, namely, the complication of operational support of language coding process of an utterance with subordination, i.e. a particular position in the structure of an utterance is not just filled with associated units of the lexical-grammatical level, but serves as a semantic-functional basis for their secondary syntaxization based on subordination. Thus, the language coding of an utterance with subordination is a dynamic functional system composed of formal language meanings standards, all kinds of descriptor rules and leading them to the action of speech-interpreting operations:

- 1) Selection of potential components of an utterance with subordination (qualitative and quantitative aspect);
- 2) The choice of the linking means between components of an utterance with subordination (relational-nominative aspect);
- 3) The choice of the arrangement of the components of an utterance with subordination (actualizing aspect).

The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that the processes of choosing linking means between the components of an utterance with subordination are described taking into account the features of speech-thinking activity of a linguistic personality. Interest to this phenomenon allows to justify the nature of subordination, as an integral part of the grammatical

system of language, its relevance to a representation in a certain way structured semantic content and, mainly, to demonstrate a complex psycholinguistic mechanism of production of an utterance with subordination included into the overall mechanism of generation of the text as a «transformed form» of speech activity.

The purpose of the research is to determine the degree of influence of linking means as actual signs of subordination on categorization and interpretation processes, as a result of which the language personality generates a subordinate structure of a certain type (complex actant, circonstant, attribute sentences).

Research methods

The main method used is the contrastive analysis. The contrastive analysis, according to G. Helbig, assumes «at least two grammars of separate languages that relate to each other and each to the other» [18, P. 31]. This creates a double dependency: on the one hand, the description of a separate language depends on the underlying grammatical theory (the first stage of dependency), on the other hand, the description of separate languages depends on their comparison (the second stage of dependency).

The analyzed material is presented by complex sentences extracted from the books of some Russian and German writers of the XX century by continuous sampling method.

Discussion

In the process of choosing the means of connection between the components of an utterance with subordination, a search is made for optimum ways of explicitly updating the DETERMINISM concept, which fixes a prototypical concept of the dependence of an extra-anthropological ontological event in the psyche of a linguistic personality, which is perceived as a state of the world at a specified moment, according to the laws of objective reality. The specificity of the described speech-interpreting operation is that intra-positional programming is carried out in two stages. At the first stage linking means are selected as representatives of the hierarchy of syntax levels, which profile relations between two extra-anthropological ontological events defined by the syntactic categorization at a specified moment. At the second stage the arrangement of subordinate components takes place in the direction determined by the position of connecting language means in the utterance. These stages are interdetermined. Here are some examples:

1) [(Куда) Connective Word *пойдут* Feature Component 2] extra-anthropological ontological event 2 ↔ [(туда) Correlative Element *несемся* Feature Component 1] extra-anthropological ontological event 1 (A. Ivanov);

2) ...и не заметишь, как окажешься на внутренней поверхности явлений, проскользив по умопомрачительной кривизне, и [выглянешь Feature Component 1 наружу Locative (оттуда) Correlative Element] extra-anthropological ontological event 1 ↔ [(откуда) Connective Word уже нет возврата Feature Component 2] extra-anthropological ontological event 2 (A. Bitov);

3) [*Mensch* Subject 1 *bleib* Feature Component 1] extra-anthropological ontological event 1 → [(wo) Connective Word *du* Subject 2 *bist* Feature Component 2 *und rühr dich nicht* Feature Component 2] extra-anthropological ontological event 2 (E. von Hirschhausen);

4) «[(Wo) Connective Word *Glaube* Subject 2 *ist* Feature Component 2] extra-anthropological ontological event 2, so spricht Hans Johst, ↔ [(dort) Correlative Element *ist* Feature Component 1 *Allmacht* Subject 1!] extra-anthropological ontological event 1» (D. Noll).

In the above utterances, connecting means profile spatial relationships. In this case, the lexical meaning of the connecting means, as well as the arrangement of subordinate components make it possible to designate the anthropically relevant coordinates of the space in which the extra-anthropological ontological event 1 develops at a certain time. *Куда* indicates the general direction of movement. This indication is supported by the lexical meaning of the correlative element *туда*, specifying the direction of the spatial perspective, which the linguistic person cannot or does not want to name. In the second utterance, the connective word *откуда* and the correlative element *оттуда* forming the regular adverbial link with it express directional perception, specifying the semantics of the feature component of the extra-anthropological ontological event 1 *выглянешь*. The extra-anthropological ontological event 2 in the utterances performs the function of a locative (complex subordinate circonstant sentences). In the third and fourth utterances, the connective word *wo* conveys relations of spatial localization, in which the development of an extra-anthropological ontological event 1 is limited to a certain spatial sphere. The extra-anthropological ontological event 2 in these utterances performs the function of a localizer (complex subordinate actant sentences).

Concerning the arrangement of subordinate components, when a connective word is prepositioned (utterances 1, 4), the order of the subordinate components is determined by their cognitive and / or text hierarchical organization, when a connective word is in postposition (utterances 2, 3), the order of the subordinate components fixes different spatial and / or temporal localization of correlated extra-anthropological ontological events.

There are statements with subordination of two types: conjunctions and connective words and correlative elements.

Conjunctions belong to the service parts of speech and are specially designed for profiling semantic relations defined by the syntactic categorization of the concept DETERMINISM [11, P. 711], [14, P. 98], [17, P. 4]. Depending on the semantic relations being profiled, the following groups of conjunctions are distinguished:

- **explanatory conjunctions** (*потому что, оттого что, так как, благодаря тому что, в силу того что, в результате того что, dass, ob, wie* and some others);
- **temporary conjunctions** (*как, когда, в то время как, после того как, как только, перед тем как, прежде чем, als, wenn, während, sooft, nachdem, sobald, kaum dass, bevor, ehe* and a lot of others);
- **causal conjunctions** (*потому что, оттого что, так как, благодаря тому что, в силу того что, в результате того что, da, weil, zumal, dass, dadurch dass, dafür dass, umsomehr als* and so on);
- **consecutive conjunctions** (*так что, sodass/so...dass*);
- **conditional conjunctions** (*если, когда, в (том) случае / при (том) условии если, коль скоро, wenn, falls, sofern, in sofern* etc.);
- **concessive conjunctions** (*хотя, несмотря на то что, вопреки тому что, даром что, пускай / пусть, obwohl, obgleich, wenngleich, trotzdem, wenn...auch* etc.);

- **purpose conjunctions** (*чтобы, для того чтобы, с тем чтобы, ради того чтобы, dass, dazu...dass, zu dem Zweck...dass, damit, um...zu* etc.);
- **comparative conjunctions** (*как, подобно тому как, как если бы, будто, словно, точно, wie, so...wie, wie wenn, als ob/wenn* and others).

Connective words belong to the content parts of speech – pronouns, pronouns-adverbs, numerals, – and are functional participants in an extra-anthropological ontological event, into the structure of which they are included. From a formal point of view, connective words in some cases differ from the corresponding conjunctions (compare: *почему – потому что, отчего – оттого что, для чего – для того чтобы, wodurch – dadurch dass, wofür – dafür dass, wozu – dazu...das* and so forth), in other cases – they coincide with the latter (*что, как, когда, dass, wie, als*) homonymously, in some cases do not correspond to conjunction (*чей, который, где, куда, откуда, der, welcher, warum, womöglich, wo* etc.).

Conjunctions and connective words are characterized by active valency. According to E.V. Uryson, it is natural to consider them as predicates with two semantic actants both of these semantic actants being situational (or, in our interpretation, extra-anthropologic ontological events) [13, P. 9].

The syntactic valency of conjunctions and connective words coincides with their semantic valency, i.e. each semantic actant of conjunctions and connective words corresponds to a syntactic actant. However, it should be noted that utterances with the described linking means significantly differ in the hierarchy influence directions. So, in utterances with conjunctions, a connection is established between two extra-anthropological ontological events by indicating what function the subordinated event performs in relation to the «key» subordinating one. In utterances with connective words, the function of the «key» subordinating events is determined in relation to the subordinated event. This circumstance makes the mechanism of syntactic categorization of the DETERMINISM concept «integral». Compare:

1) *Работа шла плохо, потому что в доме находился посторонний человек* (V. Tokareva);

2) *Er schlug sich querfeldein, nahm meilenweite Umwege in Kauf, wenn er eine noch Stunden entfernte Schwadron Reiter auf sich zukommen roch* (P. Süskind);

3) *Неяркий свет лампы отбрасывал причудливые блики на шкафы с книгами, картины, письменный стол и кресла, отчего все вокруг казалось загадочным* (I. Shakhova);

4) *Mutter stellte den betagten Herren meinen Sohn vor, als wäre er ihr eigener; und ich hielt Distanz, wollte nicht befragt, womöglich von den Löwe-Veteranen gefeiert werden* (G. Grass).

In the first two utterances, extra-anthropological ontological events marked by conjunctions *потому что* and *wenn* appear as components of a generative relationship that explicitly qualify generating extra-anthropological ontological events (within the framework of complex subordinate sirconstant sentences, causes and conditions). In the third and fourth utterances, the connective words of *от чего* and *womöglich* included in the structure of generating extra-anthropological ontological events refer to the «key», the main extra-anthropological ontological events that qualify them as components of generative relationships (within the framework of complex sirconstant sentences of consequence and condition).

Another variety of linking means, no less significant than conjunctions and connective words, are **correlative elements**. As signs of a subordinate connection, they contribute to profiling semantic relations between extra-anthropological ontological events that unite in an utterance and to the formation of the structural coherence of the latter (more details [2, P. 82-84], [8, P. 144], [9, P. 62] and others).

In modern Russian, correlative elements are usually attributed exclusively to demonstrative pronouns, which are primarily based on the root *m* (the so-called «т-words»). When included in the structure of an utterance, they acquire properties that qualitatively distinguish them from other categories of pronouns: they undergo some semantic changes and become non-independent linking means, suggesting the mandatory presence of a component with conjunctions and connective words. It follows that the semantic field of correlative elements turns out to be binary: *тот – кто, то – что, тогда – когда, там – где, то – если, такой – который* etc. This quality serves as the basis for differentiating the values of correlates. For example:

1) *Те, кто слышал эти слова, остановились* (Yu. Dobryakov);

2) *Он только хотел схватить Баннушка за скользкую шерсть, как нога подвернулась, Носопырь полетел* (V. Belov);

3) *Он пошел прочь от палаток, туда, где в голубой дымке надвигающихся сумерек чернели тонкие скелеты буровых вышек* (Y. Nagibin);

4) *Если мы восторжествуем над японцами, то нанесем вред назревающей революции, необходимой для задыхающей России, как свежий воздух* (A. Novikov-Priboy).

The pronoun-related link *те – кто* in the first utterance profiles the semantic relations of subjectivity (a complex subordinate actant sentence). The pronoun-related link *только – как* in the second utterance is not just a means of connecting extra-anthropological ontological events, but also a sequential indicator of the contact sequence (a complexly subdivided sirconstant sentence). The pronoun-related link *если – то* in the fourth utterance profiles the generative relations of the condition, highlighting the consequences of the implementation of the conditional extra-anthropological ontological event (a complex subordinate sirconstant sentence).

In German, as a function of correlative elements, words are related to demonstrative pronouns / *den Demonstrativpronomen* or *den hinweisenden Fürwörtern*, pronominal adverbs / *den Pronominaladverbien*, whose semantics is generalized and abstract in nature, for example, fact, place, time, etc.: *der / derjenige, die / diejenige, das / dasjenige, da, dann, deshalb, deswegen, seitdem, so*. Researchers explain this fact by the need for constructive parts of an utterance with subordination of relations in such signs that would be so abstract in meaning that they would obey the nature of connection as its attributes immediately, directly on the rights of real syntactic links [15, P. 19-20], [19, P. 670-671], [20, P. 82-83]. For example:

Aber sonderbar – kaum daß ich die ersten Schritte durch das Lokal getan, da begann es schon, flirrend und funkelnd, dieses erste phosphoreszierende Dämmern in mir (S. Zweig); Im Leben verbirgt man seine Gefühle, so lange, bis die Leute glauben, man habe gar keine, denn das ist die gute Erziehung (K. Tucholsky); Deshalb, weil ich es wissen wollte – und zwar von Konny direkt –, habe ich mich in der Nähe meiner Ehemaligen in einem Hotel mit Seeblick einquartiert (J. Schoch); Wenn er heute alles verlöre, so könnte er allein mit diesem wunderbaren Büchlein binnen Jahresfrist abermals ein reicher Mann sein (L. Feuchtwanger).

Depending on the hierarchy influences direction given by the conjunctions or the connective words, anaphoric and cataphoric correlative elements are distinguished in utterances. Anaphoric correlates refer to an extra-anthropological ontological event that makes up the content of the prepositive subordinate part. In this case, the semantic-syntactic relations are most clearly expressed, since they correspond to the actual division of the utterance. The subordinate part in the preposition usually acts as a topic, extending to the whole utterance and predetermining the type of relationship that develops between the extra-anthropological ontological events that form it. Cataphoric correlates, on the contrary, refer to an extra-anthropological ontological event, which constitutes the content of the post- or interpositive subordinate part. In this case, the utterance is distinguished by the absolute unity of communicative content. The main part fulfills its purpose only together with the subordinate part, and the individual components of its structure receive one or another semantic load only on the basis of the actual division, which characterizes the statement as a whole [10, P. 180], [16, P. 81]. Compare:

Как только смеркалось и наступала темнота, так эта темнота и царила до рассвета (V. Kataev); Wohin es (das Gedächtnis) sie jetzt treibt, dahin reichen die Worte nicht, das soll einer ihrer letzten klaren Gedanken sein (Ch. Wolf);

Но граница была там, где она была, и ничего нельзя было сделать... (L. Sobolev); Die Schläge fallen dann, wenn man «an nichts» denkt (M. Stolleis).

Conclusion

The study shows, that in the process of choosing the linking means between the components of an utterance with subordination, a search is made for optimum methods for explicit updating of the DETERMINISM concept. Within the framework of this speech-intelligible operation, the qualitative selection of components and their arrangement are interrelated.

It has been found that conjunctions and connective words in the languages with different structures (such as Russian and German) have common properties that are equally shown in the analyzed languages with few exceptions. Thus, conjunctions and connective words are distinguished by active valence properties, that is why they can have semantic actants which have functions of extra-anthropological ontological events that are combined in an utterance. At the same time, in utterances with conjunctions a connection is established between two extra-anthropological ontological events indicating the function performed by the subordinated event in relation to the subordinating event, and in utterances with connective words — the function of the subordinating event in relation to the subordinated one.

The analysis has revealed that correlative elements as signs of a subordinate connection contribute to the profiling semantic relations between extra-anthropological ontological events and form a structural cohesion of the latter. Depending on the hierarchy influences direction specified by the conjunction or the connective word, the anaphoric and cataphoric correlative elements are distinguished in an utterance.

The analysis of the language material has revealed that in the Russian and German languages there are some certain differences in the language means used as correlative elements. In the modern Russian language, the functions of correlative elements are performed exclusively by demonstrative pronouns having in the root *m*. When included in the structure of an utterance, they have some semantic changes and become independent linking means, assuming the mandatory presence of a component with a conjunction or a connective word, which is the basis for differentiating their meanings. In the modern German language, the functions of correlative elements are performed by demonstrative pronouns or pronominal adverbs, whose semantics is generalized and abstract, such as fact, place, time, etc. This fact is explained by the need for constructive parts of an utterance with subordination in such signs that would be so abstract in meaning that they would obey the nature of the connection as its attributes immediately, directly on the rights of real syntactic links.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Список литературы / References

1. Аль Хаснави А. Р. М. Сирконстанты позиционной схемы высказываний, в основе формирования которых лежит схема «кто / что проявляет себя как» / А. Р. М. Аль Хаснави // Вестник Челябинского государственного педагогического университета. Филологические науки. – 2017. – № 5. – С. 132–138.
2. Белошапкова В. А. Сложное предложение в современном русском языке / В. А. Белошапкова. – М.: Просвещение, 1967. – 160 с.
3. Бенвенист Э. Категории мысли и категории языка / Э. Бенвенист // Эмиль Бенвенист. Общая лингвистика. – Благовещенск: БГК им. И. А. Бодуэна де Куртенэ, 1998. – С. 104–114.
4. Гак В. Г. Высказывание и ситуация / В. Г. Гак // Проблемы структурной лингвистики. – М.: Наука, 1973. – С. 349–372.
5. Ильичева Е. Г. Когнитивные основы структурирования гипотаксисных отношений в английском языке / Е. Г. Ильичева // Известия высших учебных заведений. Поволжский регион. Серия Гуманитарные науки. Филология. – 2010. – № 2 (14). – С. 87–92.
6. Кацнельсон С. Д. Речемыслительные процессы / С. Д. Кацнельсон // Вопросы языкознания. – 1984. – № 4. – С. 3–12.
7. Кубрякова Е. С. Номинативный аспект речевой деятельности / Е. С. Кубрякова. – М.: Наука, 1986. – 158 с.: ил.

8. Кузнецова Р. Д. К истории укрепления соотносительных слов в сложноподчиненном предложении / Р. Д. Кузнецова, Е. А. Тихомирова // Синтаксические отношения в сложном предложении / М-во образования и науки Рос. Федерации, «Калининский гос. ун-т». – Калинин, 1989. – С. 142–157.
9. Максимов Л. Ю. Теоретические основы описания сложноподчиненных предложений / Л. Ю. Максимов // Ученые записки МГПИ им. В.И. Ленина «Русский язык». – 1968. – № 296. – С. 56–92.
10. Распопов И. П. Очерки по теории синтаксиса / И. П. Распопов. – Воронеж: Изд-во ВГУ, 1973. – 219 с.
11. Русская грамматика. В 2 т. Т. I. Фонетика. Фонология. Ударение. Интонация. Введение в морфемiku. Словообразование. Морфология / Под ред. Н. Ю. Шведовой. – М.: Наука, 1980. – 788 с.
12. Де Соссюр Ф. Курс общей лингвистики / Редакция Ш. Балли и А. Сеше; пер. с франц. А. Сухотина; Де Мауро Т. Библиографические и критические заметки о Ф. де Соссюре; Примечания / Пер. с франц. С.В. Чистяковой. Под общ. ред. М.Э. Рут. – Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 1999. – 432 с.
13. Урысон Е. В. Союзы, коннекторы и теория валентностей [Электронный ресурс] / Е. В. Урысон // Доклад на Международной конференции по компьютерной лингвистике «Диалог – 2012», 30 мая – 3 июня 2012 г. – 20 с. – URL: www.dialog-21.ru_20. (дата обращения: 30.07.2020)
14. Шахматов А. А. Синтаксис русского языка. Вып. 2. Учение о частях речи. Дополнения. / А. А. Шахматов. – Л.: Изд-во Акад. наук СССР, 1927. – [2], IV, 212 с.
15. Blühdorn H. Syntax und Semantik der Konnektoren. Ein Überblick / H. Blühdorn. – Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache, 2008. – 67 P.
16. Brauner U. Temporale Satzgefüge mit einmaligem Zeitbezug im Deutschen und Italienischen / U. Brauner. – Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag, 1997. – 358 P.
17. Dergacheva I. Selecting Russian conjunctions for the Swedish-Russian and Russian-Swedish dictionary mini+ / I. Dergacheva. – Stockholm, 2013. – 32 p.
18. Helbig G. Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht / G. Helbig, J. Buscha. – Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1986. – 737 P.
19. Helbig G. Prinzipien der kontrastiven Analyse / G. Helbig. – Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1973. – 112 P.
20. Wunderlich D. Zur Syntax der Präpositionalphrasen im Deutschen / D. Wunderlich // Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft. – 1984. – Jahrgang 3. H. 1. – P. 65–99.

Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Al Khasnavi A. R. M. Sirkonstanty pozicionnoj skhemy vyskazyvanij, v osnove formirovaniya kotoryh lezhit skhema «kto / chto proyavlyayet sebya kak» [Sirconstants of the Positional Pattern of Statements Based on the «Who / What Behaves Like»] / A. R. M. Al Hasnawi // Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State Pedagogical University. Philological Sciences. – 2017. – No. 5. – P. 132–138. [in Russian]
2. Beloshapkova V. A. Slozhnoe predlozhenie v sovremennom russkom yazyke [A Complex Sentence in Modern Russian] / V. A. Beloshapkova. – М.: Education, 1967. – 160 p. [in Russian]
3. Benvenist E. Kategorii mysli i kategorii yazyka [Categories of Thought and Categories of Language] / E. Benvenist // Emil Benvenist. General Linguistics. – Blagoveshchensk: BGK them. I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, 1998. – P. 104–114. [in Russian]
4. Hack V. G. Vyskazyvanie i situaciya [Statement and Situation] / V. G. Hack // Problems of Structural Linguistics. – М.: Science, 1973. – P. 349–372. [in Russian]
5. Ilicheva E. G. Kognitivnye osnovy strukturirovaniya gipotaksisnyh otnoshenij v anglijskom yazyke [Cognitive Foundations of Structuring Hypotactic Relations in the English Language] / E. G. Ilicheva // News of Higher Educational Institutions. Volga Region. Series Humanities. Philology. – 2010. – No. 2 (14). – P. 87–92. [in Russian]
6. Katsnelson S. D. Rechemyslitel'nye processy [Rehumant Thinking Processes] / S. D. Katsnelson // Questions of Linguistics. – 1984. – No. 4. – P. 3–12. [in Russian]
7. Kubryakova E. S. Nominativnyj aspekt rechevoj deyatel'nosti [Nominative Aspect of Speech Activity] / E. S. Kubryakova. – М.: Nauka, 1986. – 158 p.: ill. [in Russian]
8. Kuznetsova R. D. K istorii ukrepleniya sootnositel'nyh slov v slozhnopodchinennom predlozhenii [On the History of Strengthening Correlative Words in a Complex Sentence] / R. D. Kuznetsova, E. A. Tikhomirova // Syntactic Relations in a Complex Sentence / M. of Education and Science Ros. Federation, «Kalinin State. Un-t». – Kalinin, 1989. – P. 142–157. [in Russian]
9. Maksimov L. Yu. Teoreticheskie osnovy opisaniya slozhnopodchinennyh predlozhenij [Theoretical Foundations of the Description of Complex Sentences] / L. Yu. Maksimov // Uchenye Zapiski MGPI im. IN AND. Lenin's «Russian Language». – 1968. – No. 296. – P. 56–92. [in Russian]
10. Raspopov I. P. Ocherki po teorii sintaksisa [Essays on the Theory of Syntax] / I. P. Raspopov. – Voronezh: Publishing House of the Voronezh State University, 1973. – 219 p. [in Russian]
11. Russian Grammar. In II vol. Vol. I. Phonetics. Phonology. Stress Intonation. Introduction to morphemic. Word Formation. Morphology / Ed. N. Yu. Swedova. – М.: Nauka, 1980. – 788 p. [in Russian]
12. de Saussure F. Kurs obshchej lingvistiki [Course in General Linguistics] / Edited by S. Balli and A. Séche; trans. with French A. Sukhotina; De Mauro T. Bibliographic and Critical Notes on F. de Saussure; Notes / Per. with French S.V. Chistyakova. Under the total. ed. M.E. Ruth. – Yekaterinburg: Publishing House Ural. University, 1999. – 432 p. [in Russian]
13. Uryson E. V. Soyuzy, konnektory i teoriya valentnostej [Unions, Connectors and Theory of Valencies] [Electronic Resource] / E. V. Uryson // Report at the International Conference on Computer Linguistics «Dialogue – 2012», May 30 – June 3, 2012. – 20 p. – URL: www.dialog-21.ru_20. (accessed: 30.07.2020)

14. Shakhmatov A. A. Sintaksis russkogo yazyka. Vyp. 2. Uchenie o chastyah rechi. Dopolneniya [Syntax of the Russian Language. Vol. 2. The Doctrine of the Parts of Speech. Additions] / A. A. Shakhmatov. – L.: Publishing House of Acad. Sciences of the USSR, 1927. – [2], IV, 212 p. [in Russian]
15. Blyuhdorn H. Syntax und Semantik der Konnektoren. Ein Überblick [Syntax and Semantics of Connectors. Overview] / H. Blyuhdorn. – Mannheim: Institute of the German Language, 2008. – 67 p. [in German]
16. Brauner U. Temporale Satzgefüge mit einmaligem Zeitbezug im Deutschen und Italienischen [Single-shot Complex Sentences of Time in German and Italian] / U. Brauner. – Heidelberg: Publisher Julius Groos, 1997. – 358 p. [in German]
17. Dergacheva I. Selecting Russian conjunctions for the Swedish-Russian and Russian-Swedish dictionary mini+ / I. Dergacheva. – Stockholm, 2013. – 32 p.
18. Helbig G. Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht [Principles of Contrastive Analysis] / G. Helbig. – Leipzig: VEB Encyclopedia Publishing House, 1973. – 112 p. [in German]
19. Helbig G. Prinzipien der kontrastiven Analyse [German Grammar: a Guide for Studying Foreigners] / G. Helbig, J. Buscha. – Leipzig: VEB Encyclopedia Publishing House, 1986. – 737 p. [in German]
20. Wunderlich D. Zur Syntax der Präpositionalphrasen im Deutschen [To the Syntax of Phrases with Prepositions in German] / D. Wunderlich // Journal of Linguistics. – 1984. – Issue 3. Vol. 1. – Pp. 65–99. [in German]