YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY

TRANSLATION STUDIES:

THEORY AND PRACTICE

International Scientific Journal

YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Translation Studies

TRANSLATION STUDIES: THEORY AND PRACTICE

International Scientific Journal

volume 1 | issue 1

THE CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF THE CONJUNCTION 'AND' IN ENGLISH AND ARMENIAN

ANAHIT HOVHANNISYAN

M. NALBANDYAN STATE UNIVERSITY OF SHIRAK FOUNDATION

Abstract: In linguistics the structuring role of conjunctions is emphasized, whereas their pragmatic and contrastive study is often foregrounded. Conjunction may be prerequisite for contrastive study.

The present research is mainly aimed at establishing semantic - functional characteristics of the conjunction 'and,' as well as identifying its equivalents in Armenian translation. In other words only one translation direction is investigated, namely English to Armenian. The merit of this research lies in the fact that the study of conjunction from contrastive perspective reveals structural similarities and dissimilarities of the source language and the target language.

Contrastive study can be used to get new insights into syntax and the findings of this analysis can prove to be useful in such fields as comparative grammar, pragmatics, second-language teaching, etc.

Key words: contrastive study, coordinative conjunction (and), semantic range, pragmatic marker, stylistic device

1. Introduction

Grammatical structure is a reverberation of our worlds vision that is characteristic not of an individual but of a whole nation. If grammar is the body of a language then syntax is the soul of this body. The latter breathes the art of our cognition, the scent of our culture.

Morphology of a language is filled with knowledge of *parts of speech* as the waters cover the sea. Despite efforts made by various linguists, parts of speech still remain in many respects as one of the controversial problems in grammar.

Parts of speech are unanimously defined as lexico-grammatical grouping having categorial meaning primary syntactic function. The interaction of the two factors both the semantic content of the word in language and the function of this content in speech make a part of speech. Formation comes to be part of speech constants which creates the morphological paradigm (Koshevaya 1982:60).

Primary *syntactic functions* are: subject, object and predicative for nouns; attribute and predicative for adjectives; adverbial modifier for adverbs (Anward 1997).

Classification of parts of speech:

All parts of speech in English are subdivided into *notional (open)* and functional (closed).

Notional parts of speech are open classes - new items can be added to them, they are indefinitely extendable. Functional parts of speech are closed systems, including a limited number of members. They cannot be extended by creating new items. The main

notional parts of speech are nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Members of these four classes are often connected by derivational relations: strength - strengthen.

A word in English is very often not marked morphologically and it is easy for words to pass from one class to another (round as a noun, adjective, verb and preposition). Such words are treated either as lexico-grammatical homonyms or as words belonging to one class (Ivanova 1981).

Functional parts of speech are prepositions, conjunctions, articles, particles. The distinctive features of functional parts of speech are: 1) very general and weak lexical meaning; 2) obligatory combinability; 3) the function of linking and specifying words. Pronouns constitute a class of words which takes an intermediary position between notional and functional words. On the one hand, they can substitute for nouns and adjectives, on the other hand, pronouns are used as connectives and specifiers. There may be also groups of closed-system items within an open class (notional, functional and auxiliary verbs) (Studiopedia.su 2014:16).

2. General overview

This part of the research gives an overview of current work sourced from a wide spectrum of theories on this topic. Leung states that conjunctions have been studied under various labels and have drawn much attention from various scholars in the field of English/Linguistics over time (Leung 2005). It is common knowledge that conjunction is a grammatical class of words whose task is to join other grammatical units and structures together (Jeffries 2006). On contrary, Alexandrova and Komov (1998) label them as "lexico-grammatical class." It becomes clear that the authors think of conjunction from another standpoint, describing them as lexico-grammatical. This suggestion is acceptable for us as the definition "lexico-grammatical" overlaps both lexical (categorial meaning) and grammatical characteristics of conjunctions. Apart from this the definition "lexico-grammatical" goes in harmony with the same labelling of other parts of speech. Halliday and Hasan treat them as "linguistic devices that create cohesion." A general survey on English conjunctions as means of textual cohesion can still be considered a true landmark in the study of the syntax and semantics of conjunctions. According to Aidinlou and Reshadi, conjunctions are a "semantic connection between two clauses." A wider cross-linguistic perspective is adopted by Lehmann 1991, who focuses on its semantic and structural role in complex phrases and complex sentences.

D. Schiffrin studies conjunctions in the frame of discourse. From this point of view conjunctions are worded as discourse markers obtaining a wider functional status since they operate at the level of utterances rather than at the level of sentences.

Pons Bordería provides a clear discussion of the differences and similarities between connectives and discourse markers. Although conjunctions are used mainly for linking, a number of researchers distinguish their *grammatical*, *syntactic and functional* features and claim that there are differences between *conjunctions and connectors*. It is therefore essential to understand the differences of conjunctions and connectors in order to have a better knowledge and thus usage of these coordinators (Pons Bordería 2001).

In the present study, we are in the line with the linguists claiming that connectors are defined as linguistic items which signal a two-place relation between segments of text above the level of the phrase, i.e., between sentences or chunks of discourse (Blakemore 1999). The meaning of a connector is procedural, not conceptual: it does not change the propositional content of any of the segments it relates. Connectors thus reveal or make explicit the connections already operating in a text. To put it simply, conjunctions conjoin related or unrelated units together in a sentence; connectives conjoin units that are somewhat related or to show the reason or result for something (such as therefore, thus and as a result)

Conjunctions fulfill the functions of coordination and subordination within a sentence and within different clauses of complex sentence between separate sentences (Alexandrova and Komova 1998:67)

The subordination in syntactic structure is another of the recursive features of human language and one that allows us to make an infinitely large number of utterances out of a large but finite stock of units (Jefferies 2006:144).

Coordination is the process of joining two grammatical units or structures of the same level (i.e. word, phrase or clause) together by the use of a coordinating conjunction (Jefferies 2006:228). The coordination does not change the structure in any significant way, but simply adds some content to it. The units that are being coordinated we call conjoins (Aarts 2001:46). Coordination is expressed by *and*, *but or*. Among these three conjunctions is of great functional use the onjunction 'and.'

The further step of the analysis reveals the semantic scope of the conjunction 'and' and its renderings into Armenian.

3. Semantic-Functional Spectrum of the Conjunction 'and'

• The conjunction 'and' can conjoin or link words, phrases, sentences, etc.

Coordination can operate at any level of language structure: at the level of word, at the level of word combination and at the level of sentence.

a) At the level of word more than two units of equal syntactic status are strung together with the coordinator:

Conscience and cowardice are really the same things, Basil. (Wilde 1891:9) Խիդձն ու վախո փաստորեն նույն բաներն են, Բեզիլ։ (Wilde 2012:14)

The ugly and the stupid have the best of it in this world. (ibid., 5)

Այս աշխարհում միշտ շահում են այլանդակներն ու հիմարները։ (ibid., 9)

The harmony of soul and body, - how much it is! (ibid., 14)

Հոգու և մարմնի ներդաշնակություն․․․Ինչ գեղեցիկ է հնչում։ (ibid., 19)

He has a simple and a beautiful nature. (ibid., 18)

Նա պարզ և գեղեցիկ հոգի ունի։ (ibid., 25)

Lord Henry smiled and looked at Dorian. (ibid., 21)

Լորդ Հենրին ժպտաց ու նայեց Դորիանին։ (ibid., 27)

Lord Henry took up his hat and gloves. (ibid., 22)

Լորդ Հենրին վերցրեց գլխարկն ու ձեռնոցները։ (ibid., 28)

I like tea and coffee. (ibid., 39)

Ես ամենից շատ թեյ և սուրձ եմ սիրում։ (ibid., 42)

Rouge and esprit used to go together. (ibid., 45)

Այն ժամանականերում «rouge» և «espirit» հասկացությունները անբաժան էին։ (ibid., 72)

Soul and body, body and soul – how mysterious they were! (ibid., 58)

Հոգի և մարմին, մարմին և հոգի... ի՞նչ հանելուկ է դա։ (ibid., 87)

The pulse and passion of youth were in him. (ibid., 58)

Նրա մեջ ամբողջովին պատանեկան ավյուն ու կիրք էր։ (ibid., 58)

The gallery and pit were fairly full. (ibid., 47)

Վերնասրահը և վերջին շարքերը լի էին մարդկանցով։ (ibid., 74)

Women went about with oranges and ginger- beer. (ibid., 47)

Շարքերի միջով անցնում էին նարինջ և իմբիրի գարեջուր վաձառող կանայք։ (ibid., 74)

b) Word combinations (Phrasal coordination)

A specific type of syndetic coordination in the sequence of which are linked phrases as conjoins:

I remember her bringing me up to a most truculent and red-faced old gentleman. (Wilde 1891:10)

Հիշում եմ, թե ինչպես նա մի անգամ ինձ ներկայացրեց շքանշաններով ծածկված կարմրադեմ ու ահեղ մի ծեր ջենտյմենի։ (Wilde 2012:6)

There is a fatality about all physical and intellectual distinction. (ibid., 5)

Մարդկանց ձակատագրում, որոնք ֆիզիկապես և հոգեպես կատարյալ են, օրհասական մի բան կա։ (ibid., 5)

In this sentence the attributive phrase is transformed an attributive clause in the target language.

With his beautiful face, and his beautiful soul, he was a thing to wonder at. (Wilde 1891:58)

Գեղեցիկ դեմքով և գեղեցիկ հոգով այդ պատանին կենդանի հետաքրքրություն էր առաջացնում իր հանդեպ։ (Wilde 2012:58)

Oh, she was so shy, and so gentle. (ibid., 52)

O՜, նա այնքան ամոթիած և այնքան հաձելի։ (ibid., 80)

Don't run down dyed hair and painted faces. (ibid., 50)

Մի արհամարհեք ներկած մազերը և շպարված դեմքերը։ (ibid., 77)

c) Sentences of independent status are linked involving an overt coordinator:

A portrait like this would set you far above all the young men in England, *and* make the old men quite jealous. (Wilde 1891:4)

Այս դիմանկարը քեզ վեր կբարձրացնի Անգլիայի բոլոր երիտասարդ նկարիչներից *և* կշարժի ծերերի նախանձը։ (Wilde 2012:8)

I choose my friends for their good looks, my acquaintances for their characters, and my enemies for their brains. (ibid., 11)

Որպես բարեկամ՝ ես ընտրում եմ գեղեցիկ մարդկանց, որպես ընկեր՝ լավ համ-բավ ունեցողնեին *և* որպես թշնամի՝ խելացիներին։ (ibid., 16)

You will bitterly reproach him in your own heart, *and* seriously think that he has behaved very badly to you. (ibid., 16)

Քո հոգու խորքում դու դառնորեն կհանդիմանես նրան b ամենալուրջ ձևով կմտածես, որ նա ինչ — որ բանով մեղավոր է քո առաջ։ (ibid., 22)

I went to look after a piece of old brocade in Wardour Street, and had to bargain for hours for it. (ibid., 43)

Գնացել էի Ուորդոր սթրիթ՝ հինավուրց դիպակի կտոր դնելու *և* ստիպված էի սակարկել ժամերը։ (ibid., 70)

I go to see her act every night of my life, *and* every night she is more marvelous. (ibid., 53)

Ամեն երեկո գնում եմ նայելու նրա խաղը, b ամեն երեկո նա ինձ թվում է ավելի հիանալի։ (ibid., 81)

You will always be loved, and you will always be in love with love. (ibid., 47)

2kg thom uhpmhmpdkint ku, h Into thom uhpmhmpdkint kp uhpntu: (ibid., 73)

• The conjunction 'and' as a temporal marker

The conjunction 'and' does more than conjoin the two clauses. It can often express temporality, locating events on time span or describe the temporal sequence of states of affairs. In this case the main function of the conjunction is to simply narrate events. In case of strong arrangements of the events in temporal relations the structuring role of conjunction does not work anymore.

1. Sequencing of events. Relationships of sequence indicates (signals) explicitly the order in which actions' states occur. They also mark how one action leads to another. It is a chunk of actions in which all chains are interwoven with each other and any shift in the direction of this narration can break the logical statement of affairs.

The chronology of events finds its *syndetic counterpart* in the translations, as:

The boys stopped their play and flocked about the prince. (Twain 1997:10)

Երեխաները խաղը դադարեցրին h խառնվեցին արքայազնի շուրջը։ (Twain 1980:23)

Tom slept again, and after a time he had this pleasant dream. (ibid., 41)

Թոմը նորից քնեց *ու* մի քիչ հետո մի նշանավոր երազ տեսավ։ (ibid., 92)

I grew afraid, and turned to quit the room. (ibid., 9)

Ինձ համակեց զարհուրելի սարսափ, *և* որոշելով հեռանալ՝ ուզում էի շարժվել դեպի դուռը։ (ibid., 13)

Though in the above-mentioned sentence the sequence of events finds the same location in the past span in the target language, the temporal sequence of states of affairs implies in the deep structure argumentation which in the translation is framed as a verbal phrase - npn2blnd hbmuhul.

Lord Henry smiled, and, learning down, plucked a pink-petalled daisy from grass, and examined it. (Wilde 1891:9)

Լորդ Հենրին ժպտաց, *և* թեքվելով՝ խոտի միջից քաղեց մի վարդագույն մարգարտածաղիկ։ (Wilde 2012:12)

I turned half - way round, and saw Dorian Gray for the first time. (ibid., 8)

Շրջվեցի *ու* առաջին անգամ տեսա Դորիան Գրելին։ (ibid., 13)

He glanced quickly round, and rose to his feet. (ibid., 42)

Դորիանն արագ շրջվեց *ու* ոտքի ելավ։ (ibid., 68)

I really went in *and* paid a whole guinea for the stage- box. (ibid., 46)

Ես իսկապես ներս մտա b մի ամբողջ գիենա վճարեցի բեմի մոտ գտնվող օթյակի համար։ (ibid., 73)

b) Asyndetically

Very often one may come across sentences which are coordinated but do not have any coordinator between them; coordination being singled only by punctuation.

In the below-mentioned sentences the conjunction 'and' is omitted in Armenian translations.

Because of the absence of explicit link independent clauses begin to act as main clauses, that is clauses can form whole sentences of their own:

Julia took a cigarette and the young man struck a match for her. (Maugham 1937:3)

Ջուլիան մի սիգարետ վերցրեց։ Երիտասարդը կրակ մատուցեց նրա համար։ (Maugham 1985:6)

The door opened and Michael Gosselyn looked up. (ibid., 3)

Դուռը բացվեց։ Մալքլ Գոսսլինը գլուխը բարձրացրեց։ (ibid., 5)

But he had moved the table, *and* he was on his knees, and she was in his arms. (ibid., 67)

Բայց տղամարդն արդեն մի կողմ էր տարել սեղանը։ Ծնկի էր իջել Ջուլիայի մոտ ու գիրկն էր առել նրան։ (ibid., 104)

In this sentence the conjunction shows temporal relation. Also the omission of 'and' sets forth the transformation of the sentence:

```
At last he heard a light step outside, and the door opened. (Wilde 1891:41) Վերջապես դրսից լսվեց ոտնաձայն։ Դուռը բացվեց։ (Wilde 2012:67)
```

- 2 Temporal relations may imply narration of past events that are architectured either syndetically or asyndetically both in the original and in mother tongue.
 - Syndetically (clauses are coordinated by the use of the conjunction). In sentences with conjunctions the syntactic bond that connects the independent clause of a compound is very tight:

Roger was seventeen now and in a year would be going to Cambridge. (Maugham 1937:66)

Ռոջերը այժմ տասնյոթ տարեկան է $\it h$ մեկ տարուց գնալու է Քեմբրիջ։ (Maugham 1985:12)

Lord Henry elevated his eyebrows, *and* looked at him in amazement through the thin blue wreaths of smoke that curled up in such fanciful whorls from his heavy opiumtainted cigarette. (Wilde 1891:3)

Լորդ Հենրին զարմացած բարձրացրեց հոնքերը *և* Բեզինին նայեց կապույտ ծխի քուլաների միջից, որոնք արտասովոր օղակներով բարձրանում էին նրա՝ ափիոնով ներծծված սիգարետից։ (Wilde 2012:7-8)

He spoke very slowly, *and* the words seemed wrung out of him almost against his will. (ibid., 18)

Նա խոսում էր շատ դանդաղ, *և* կարծես բառերը դուրս էին գալիս հակառակ իր կամքի։ (ibid., 25)

• Asyndetically (clauses are coordinated by the use of commas alone or coordinated clauses are simply placed next to each other in the target language):

It was getting on for Easter, and Jimmie Langton always closed his theatre for Holy Week. (Maugham 1937:20)

Մոտենում էր զատկի տոնը։ Ջիմմի Լենգթընը միշտ զատկի նախորդ՝ չարչարանաց շաբաթվա ընթացքում, փակում էր թատրոնը։ (Maugham 1985:33) But all things must have an end, *and* so in time Tom Canty was in a condition to get out of bed. (Twain 1997:41)

Բայց աշխարհում ամեն բան վաղ թե ուշ վերջանում է։ Թոմ Քենթին էլ վերջապես հնար ունեցավ անկողնից վեր կենալու։ (Twain 1980:95)

Some days passed, *and* one morning, while Julia was reading a play, they rang through from the basement to ask if she would speak to Mr. Fennell. (ibid., 65)

Մի քանի օր անց առավոտյան, մինչ Ջուլիան պառկած մի նոր պիես էր կարդում, ընդունարանից զանգեցին հարցնելու, արդյոք ցանկանո՞ւմ է խոսել միստր Ֆեննըլի հետ։ (ibid., 101)

• The conjunction displays principles for argumentation

It is commonly assumed that argumentation as a general notion is concerned with *reasoning;* a process of arguing in favor of or against an action, an opinion, tricky cases, etc.

Syntactic argumentation is about reasoning in the domain of syntax (Aarts 2001:171). Let us look at the following example:

If you stay any longer in this glare you will be quite spoiled, *and* Basil will never paint you again. (Wilde 1891:27)

Եթե Դուք մի քիչ էլ երկար մնաք արևի տակ, բոլորովին կփչացնեք Ձեր դեմքը, և Բեզիլն այլևս չի ուզի Ձեզ նկարել։ (Wilde 2012:35)

The reasoning beyond the analysis was the fact that the latter part of the utterance (you will be quite spoiled) is set to complement the meaning of the former part (If you stay any longer in the glare...). The former and the latter parts express cause-result relation here. Resultative phrases are always predicated of. Curiously, however, there is nothing that can be predicated of. This is a proposition, mainly the proposition "that he will be spoiled and..." and this proposition is not necessarily wrong. The flood of information and argumentation on English reader create similar reactions for Armenian readers.

Argumentation runs much in the same way in the rest examples:

Resist it, and your soul grows sick with longing for the things it has forbidden to itself. (Wilde 1891:24)

Փորձիր ընդդիմադրել, *և* հոգիդ կհյուծվի՝ ձգտելով արգելվածին։ (Wilde 2012:31) He was bareheaded, *and* the leaves had tossed his rebellious curls and tangled all their gilded threads. (ibid., 27)

Նա գլխաբաց էր, *և* ձյուղերը դիպչում էին նրա անհնազանդ գանգուրներին և խառնում ոսկեթել մազերը։ (ibid., 34)

They are all men of some intellectual power, *and* consequently they all appreciate me. (ibid., 11)

Նրանք բոլորն էլ մտածող մարդիկ են, *և* բավականին ինտելիգենտ, և այդ պատձառով էլ կարողանում են գնահատել ինձ։ (ibid., 16)

• The conjunction implies condition

The conjunction 'and' can be translated as 'hul' especially at the beginning of the sentence. As we know there is a persistent belief that it is improper to begin a sentence with a conjunction 'and.' But he research data show that taking the initial position in the sentence the conjunction operates as a pragmatic marker testifying once again that any specific instance of language use in neither wholly grammatical nor wholly pragmatic (Ariel 2008). The encoded message in such types of utterances is peppered with pragmatic flavor. Semantics always goes with grammar as the sun goes with the moon. This relationship unleashes the correlation between a form of a linguistic unit and its use: the relevant use of conjunction embroiders the utterance with temporal meaning of futurity showing that one thing will take place on the condition of the other.

Target language equivalence of 'and' completely renders the same situation as in the original.

In terms of usage and frequency of occurrence 'and utterances' with condition are widely used in dialects and in reported speech:

```
"And I- I", she thought. (Maugham 1937:25)
«Իսկ ե՞ս...ե՞ս», — մտածեց Ջուլիան։ (Maugham 1985:32)
And if takes me for a second year I'm to get three hundred. (ibid., 25)
Իսկ եթե ինձ պահեն նաև երկրորդ տարվա համար, ես կստանամ երեք հարյուր։ (ibid., 41)
"And if he rings up again?" (ibid., 166)
-Իսկ եթե նորի՞ց զանգի։ (ibid., 252)
```

• 'And' conjunction expresses speaker's outrage

'And' can be artfully used for creating a new effect as in the below-adduced examples. This function is fulfilled indirectly and points to an expressive function of the conjunction, implying speaker's attitude towards the objects or phenomena of the word. Such utterances review the stylistic potentialities of connectors when accumulated and interpreted within the message of the whole.

In Armenian translations there are no obvious losses both on plane of content and that of stylistic effect:

I have just been telling him what a capital sitter you were, *and* now you have spoiled everything. (Wilde 1891:20)

Ես հենց նոր նրան ասում էի, թե Դուք ինչքան հիանալի եք բնորդում, h ահա Դուք Ձեր փնթփնթոցով ամեն ինչ փչացրեցիք։ (Wilde 2012:26)

Words! Mere words! How terrible they were! How clear, and vivid, and cruel! (ibid., 25) Իսկ այստեղ խոսքեր էին,սովորական խոսքեր, բայց որքանա սարսափելի, պարզ, կենդանի h միաժամանակ դաժան։ (ibid., 26)

4. Conclusion

The conjunction 'and' can function as a subordinator, as an adverb, etc. In contrast to but, or, *and* has highest distribution. Conjunction 'and' has the least specific meaning. It can also express temporality, locating events in time or describing the temporal sequence of states of affairs. In contrast to well-established conditions, conditional sentences with *and* are emotionally loaded expressing also speaker's/writer's attitude to the events, states implied in the frame of the given sentence. Even the conjunction operates as an argumentative marker. The conjunction 'and' does much more than conjoin the two clauses. It functions also as an 'emotional device' expressing the speaker's surprise, outrage. The data obtained show that the conjunction can often find its counterpart in the target language being rendered as *hul*₁, *lu*, *nu*, *puyg* or in some cases it can be omitted and the omission of the conjunction is compensated by a punctuation mark. In Armenian, punctuation is logical and obligatory. One must follow strictly the rules of punctuation. In the English language punctuation is not mandatory. It has both grammatical and semantic-stylistic function. As the conjunction is context dependent, the implied meanings are rendered differently.

References

Aarts, Bars. 2001. English Syntax and Argumentation. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave.

Aidinlou, Nader Assadi, and Elnaz Reshadi. "A Comparative Study of the Use of Conjunctions and References in Electronic Mails vs. Paper- based Letters." In *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 611-615, 2014. Print

Anward, Jan, Edith Moravcsik, and Leon Stassen. 1977. "Parts of Speech: A Challenge for Typology." In *Linguistic Typology* 1, 167-183.

Ariel, Mira. 2008. *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Blakemore, Diane, and Robin Carston. 1999. "The Pragmatics of 'and' Conjunctions. The Non-narrative Cases." In *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 5, 277-298.

Chalker, Sylvia. 1996. *Collins Cobuild English Guides 9: Linking Words*. London: HarperCollins.

Halliday, M.A.K., and R. Hans. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hertwig, Ralph, Björn Benz, and Stefan Krauss. 2008. *The Conjunction Fallacy and the Many Meanings of 'and.'* Elsevier Print, 97 Language Sciences.

Jeffries, Lesly. 2006. Discovering Language. New York: Palgrave. MacMillan.

- Koshevaya, Irina. 1982. The Theory of English Grammar. Moscow: Prosvesheniye.
- Leech, Geoffrey, and Jan Svartvik. 1994. *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London. New York: Longman.
- Lehman, Ch. 1991. "Predicate Classes and Participation." In *Partizipation. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Sachverhalten*, 183-239. Tübingen: G. Narr.
- Leung, Carrie. 2005. A Comparison of the Use of Major English Conjunctions by American and Hong Kong University Students. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Maugham, Somerset. 1937. The Theatre. New York: Doubleday, Doran.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Payne, John. 1985. "Complex Phrases and Complex Sentences." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. II. Complex Consturctions. (ed.) Shopen, 3-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pons Bordería, Salvador. 2001. *Connectives/Discourse Markers: An Overview*. Quaderns de filologia. Estudis literaris. Vol. VI. 219-243.
- Quirk, Charles Randolph, Wrenn, Charles Leslie. 1977. *An Old English Grammar*. London: Methuen's Old English Library.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1988. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Twain, Mark. 1997. The Prince and the Pauper. London: Penguin Classics.
- Wilde, Oscar. 1891. The Picture of Dorian Grey. London: Penguin Classics.
- Մոեմ, Սոմերսեթ. 1985. *Թատրոն*. Երևան։ «Սովետական Գրող» հրատարակ-չություն.
- Տվեն, Մարկ. 1980. *Արքայազնը և աղքատը*. Երևան։ «Սովետական Գրող» հրատարակչություն.
- Ուայդ, Օսկար. 2012. *Դորիան Գրեյի դիմանկարը*. Երևան։ «Էդիթ Պրինտ» հրատարակչություն.
- Александрова, Ольга, Татьяна Комова. 1998. *Современный Английский Язык: Морфология И Синтаксис*. Москва: Изд. Академия.
- Иванова И.П., В.В. Бурлакова, Г.Г. Почепцов. 1981. *Теоретическая Грамматика Современного Английского Языка*. Москва: Изд. Высшая Школа.
- Studiopedia.su. 2014. *Notional and Functional Parts of Speech*: https://studopedia.su/14 19874 Notional-and-functional-parts-of-speech.html.



