

# Lexical Cohesion in Official Documents in Naive Metalinguistic Consciousness

Gordeeva M.N.

Department of Foreign Languages for Technical Faculties  
Novosibirsk State Technical University  
Novosibirsk, Russia  
gordeeva@corp.nstu.ru

**Abstract**—The article focuses on the peculiarities of lexical cohesion realization in two types of official documents: written by professionals that work in official organizations and by ordinary native speakers. Lexical type of cohesion, which comprises the relations of inclusion, exclusion and identity, is one of the most frequently used cohesion types with the specifics in use. The theoretical base of the issue is also described. Conclusions are based on the analysis of official documents.

**Keywords**—written official communication, textual categories, cohesion, lexical cohesion, naive metalinguistic consciousness, ordinary metalinguistic consciousness

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Naive Metalinguistics and its Object

Naive linguistics appeared to be an interest for scientific research with the influence of scientific attention to linguistic personality of ordinary native speaker and his metalinguistic consciousness (O.I. Blinova [1], N.D. Golev [2], D.Y. Polinichenko [3], A.N. Rostova [4], et al.). The object of this scientific field – that is also known as naive linguistics – is a metalinguistic component of language consciousness of ordinary native speaker: their view of structure and functions of the language, correlations of forms and meaning of its units, speakers' reflection in case of their or someone else's speech behavior. In other words, the object of naive metalinguistics is a set of naive native speakers' conscious ideas about the language itself, in its various aspects [4].

The sphere of interest within naive metalinguistic consciousness is large: a place of naive linguistics among other linguistic sciences (O.I. Blinova [1], A.N. Rostova [4]); functioning of language units, the case of so-called "orthographycentrism", the problem of studying and teaching Russian Language at school, also issues connected with the use of law language by naive speakers (N.D. Golev [2]). In addition, understanding how to write texts of different styles – scientific (N.V. Bugorskaya [5]), literary (N.A. Kuzmina [6], N.A. Nikolina [7], M.R. Shumarina [8]), official (A.A. Dyakova [9], M.V. Slautina [10], O.P. Sologub [11]) – is studied.

Our research is topical due to the fact that interpretation of official text by naive consciousness of native speaker has not been studied yet. Studying the sphere of official communication seems to be of high importance as it helps to get an idea how thorough and detailed the image of a document is in mind of

language personality; which characteristics of official text are topical for ordinary language speakers. In addition, it is necessary to reveal the way of relations between ordinary communication and tools of official style.

One of the important research examples in this sphere is the study of O.P. Sologub, who shows that ordinary native speakers tend to pay less attention to syntax and logic of the text, clearance of understanding and such an important text parameter as cohesion [11]. Considering these facts, our research is enriching the understanding of how language speakers see and use the category of textual cohesion and its tools. The present paper is devoted to its lexical type as this kind of cohesion is mostly used.

### B. Textual Category of Cohesion

Cohesion as a textual category is described in many scientific works showing not only basic, theoretical part of the problem, but also important cohesion characteristics of certain types of texts. In our work, we consider the cohesion category because it is known as the basic, constituting property of text, its central category that shows the text integrity. There is no text without cohesion, as T.V. Milevskaya once noted [12]. The scholar also wrote that cohesion is a norm for organizing discourse and essential condition for successful communication [16], because the understanding of the recipient depends on the link between facts in a textual message. Process of text creating is accompanied by transformation of mental idea from the human's mind into linear text structure, and it makes cohesion the speaker's main strategy in text making.

In other words, the aim of text building should be a will to connect such points and links that are easy to perceive by the environment or system [13]. M.A.K. Halliday и R. Hasan, who devoted their well-known research to cohesion in English, highlight that it is cohesion of meaning and form that defines text as a coherent one. The base of textual cohesion is in reference: the referent is the model of situation, which is transformed in a linear structure by speaking of writing person.

The nature of cohesion category reveals itself its connection with the category of coherence. The scientific research has shown the importance of cohesion role in coherence formation: the researchers (B.M. Leykina, Y.A. Sorokin, A.A. Leontyev, E.V. Shpar, et al.) speak about interconnectedness of these categories. Coherence has its materialization in cohesion, and cohesion is the basement of coherence: coherence is a

characteristic of result of perception of cohesive text, and the cohesion itself is a tool for getting its characteristic [14]. Cohesion is a linguistic category, and its certain language cases are results of general semantic idea of the text, but the coherence is the category of meaning, which bases on laws of textual perception and the will of recipient to unite all textual parts. The cohesion category is a language base for the category of coherence.

Scientific research considers peculiarities of cohesion on different language levels in texts belonging to various communication spheres. Cohesion in literary style is studied by I.A. Syrov, M.P. Kotyurova; work of T.I. Vostrikova, E.S. Kuzmina, R.N. Sukatch devoted their work to cohesion in scientific texts; cohesive and coherent tools in spoken language is studied by L.V. Sakharniy, I.A. Barinova. However, the wide research and analysis have been conducted, cohesion in some spheres still need thorough investigation, e.g., official communication sphere. Cohesion should be an essential characteristic of official text, even more than any other text type, because effective management needs the maximum of situation description, and facts and events should be linked in a right way. Though this textual characteristic is important for official text, it still has not been studied with a proper attention.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material chosen for this article are applications as official documents, created by naive native speakers. However, for our global research work we analyze types of documents that are easy for the ordinary native speaker to create: personal documents (applications), informational documents (memorandums). We also use the same documents created by native speakers having been trained on official documents writing courses in order to compare their knowledge with knowledge of naive native speakers. Such diversification allows us to analyze peculiarities of cohesion in several document types. The reason for the choice is impossibility for naive native speakers to create other kinds of official documents: accountant, administrative, prescriptive, etc, as the creation of them requires specific training. The present article represents the part of the research basing on the particular type of documents. The contexts with cohesion examples were collected and grouped according to the cohesion types. The punctuation and spelling of the authors of applications remain the same.

The methodology of our work includes: method of theoretical analysis (analysis of native and foreign literature in the field of Linguistics), descriptive method (to characterize language units of different levels), and statistical method (to identify quantitative relations of cohesive elements).

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Types of Cohesion

Linguistic nature of cohesion category and its appearance on various language levels allow considering the cohesion types. This side of category has been thoroughly studied in linguistic research. M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan describe the following kinds of cohesion: lexical, grammar (reference,

substitution, ellipsis) and conjunction, which is thought to be a middle type.

*Lexical cohesion* means textual links with repeated words and word forms (“Henry presented her with his own portrait. As it happened, she was always wanted a portrait of Henry”), words of one semantic field (“wool” – “sheep”), synonyms (“moment” – “minute”), opposites (“avoid” – “follow”).

*Reference* means the change of some name, property or action to pronouns or words with quantitative or qualitative meaning: “the first/the second”, “as many”, “such”, “the same”, “identical”, “different”, etc. The example “There were two wrens upon a tree. Another came, and there were three” the pronoun “another” is used instead of the noun “wren”, omitting a repetition.

*Substitution*, in contrast, means the change of a word group or sentences with word like “the same”, “likewise”, “that”, “be”, “so”, “not”, moreover, the substitution elements are from different language levels. Considering the example, “Has Barbra left? – I think so” we can say that the adverb highlights the idea, expressed in the previous sentence.

*Ellipsis*, mostly appearing in spoken language, means omitted sentences or their parts; at this case, one can understand meaning only from the context. There is no noun “folder” in the second sentence of the example “I’ve used up those three yellow folders you gave me. Can I use the other?” but this absence has no influence of reception and understanding as one can understand from the first sentence.

*Conjunction* means the link between sentences with the help of syntax conjunctions like “and”, “but”, “neither / nor”, “on the contrary”, “in such an event”, “I mean”, “in spite of”, “previously”, “afterwards”, etc.: “They fought a battle. Previously, it had snowed”.

Classification of M.A.K. Halliday and R. Hasan is considered fundamental, and had great influence on the following linguistic research. In particular, the classification of V. A. Lukin [15] includes the following cohesion types:

1) *cohesion of units of similar types* meaning repetition of images like lines, dots, etc – that can be identified by human eye. This type of cohesion allows recognizing text in the sequence of these units, and this cohesion is essential for text existence as its form;

2) *cohesion of signs in a text*, which is important for understanding and interpretation of the text. This type includes textual elements that recipient thinks to be signs: words, inverted commas, italics, etc;

3) *lexical cohesion*: links provided with index signs (pronouns, particles, adverbs, etc), that indicate referent without naming it and giving any characteristics; units (words, letters, numbers, syllables, grammar forms of words, parts of words); proper nouns, which get some connotation by the end of the text and are able to concentrate meaning of a certain part of the text (subtopics, ideas);

4) *semantic and syntactic cohesion*, including cases of presupposition and implication. Presupposition is such components of statements that addresser, as it follows from

their formulation, means to be true and already known by the recipient. It is the obvious part of statement. Implication is message that recipient can understand from the text and its components. Implication is conclusion that one could draw basing on extra knowledge, received not from the text but from world and environment. In addition, this cohesion type includes ellipsis and thematic-rhematic articulation, meaning finding topics in the text and building syntax progressions;

5) *grammar cohesion* that means repetition of some grammar forms. The most frequent appearance of this type is in literary style, when such grammar repetition is meaningful for semantic structure of the text.

T.V. Milevskaya, describing cohesion in discourse and text, introduces to speak about separate micro field of lexical and grammar cohesion because these types functionalize coherently in different ways [16]. Describing functional and pragmatic field of cohesion, she pays special attention to lexical cohesive tools in text: lexical repetition (“*Осень – пора умирания осенних листьев... Пора умирания для человека – круглогодична*” - “Autumn – the time of dying leaves... The time of dying for a man is full year” [16]), synonyms (“*Есть одно явление, ускользнувшее от вездесущей статистики: двуязычие многих собак <...>. Вот, например, наш пес при слове «собака» немедленно бросается к окну; при слове «dog» - та же реакция*” - “There is one thing that statistics doesn’t mention: bilingual dogs <...>. For example, our dog hearing the Russian word «dog» immediately runs to the window; hearing the English word «dog» - the same” [16]), opposites (“*Иногда говорят исключительно о поколении москвичей и ленинградцев <...>*” - “It’s sometimes spoken only about generations of Moscow and Leningrad <...>” [16]); in addition, the researcher mentions pronominal cohesion, the tools of which are pronouns, modal words and particles.

Therefore, there are cohesive tools of all language levels: lexical, morphological, syntactic, phonetic (this type is frequently met in poetry), and also a semantic one.

### B. Lexical Cohesion in Official Documents

In our work, attention is concentrated on the cohesion type that is used most frequently, lexical cohesion. This type is also considered the obvious one as it is mentioned in all scientific classifications. We have analyzed peculiarities of lexical cohesion and for our analysis various types of official documents were used: from strictly official (articles of association, contract) to the documents with low official characteristics (business letter, proxy, memorandum, application, complaint). We have the aim to find typical cases of cohesion in such documents, level of understanding this cohesion by naive metalinguistic consciousness. Having studied documents written by native speakers without special linguistic training, we can draw a conclusion which pattern of the given cohesion type is in their mind. The examples from official documents used in our work remain the origin punctuation and spelling.

According to the analysis done the most frequently used kind of lexical cohesion bases on the same referent. This cohesion appears in the identity relations and expresses itself in repetitions. M. I. Otkupshikova states that repetition is one of

the main conditions to organize textual cohesion, and it is so natural that can be easily thought as the only tool and condition of cohesion.

#### 1) Cohesion through Repetition

The case of the second nomination is widely used in official communication. In documents written by professionally trained specialists one can find it in separate requisite and in the document text itself, e.g. “name of organization”, “signature”, “stamp”. Name of organization, as a rule, is also repeated in a stamp, which is an additional opportunity to identify a document. If a company is an individual enterprise, its name correlates with a signature and name. Precise or not precise repetition of requisite “name of organization” also can be noticed. For example, proxy document has the following statement: “*Общество с ограниченной ответственностью «N» – Общество с ограниченной ответственностью «N» в лице директора NN <...> доверяет NNN <...>; или: Группа компаний «M» – Настоящей доверенностью Общество ООО «M», в лице Генерального директора N, действующего на основании Устава, уполномочивает NN <...> на совершение следующих действий <...>*” - “Company «N» (requisite “name of organization”) – Company «N» in the person of its director NN <...> entrusts NNN <...>”; or “Group of companies «M» (requisite “name of organization”) – The Company «M», represented by the director N with the present proxy entrusts NN <...> to complete the following actions <...>”. Such repetition provides the main text of the document with the rest of requisites, contributing to coherent document.

Concentration of repetitions in the main text of a document is high; it is especially obvious in texts of articles of association, contracts, statutes, because of necessity to make these types of documents extremely clear, as they are of high law importance. Consider the example: “*Заказчик обязуется: принять исполненные Услуги путем подписания акта об оказании Услуг либо отказаться от подписания акта об оказании Услуг путем направления заказным письмом с уведомлением мотивированного отказа от подписания указанного акта в течение 5 (пяти) календарных дней с даты, указанной в п. 1.1 настоящего Договора. В случае невыполнения Заказчиком обязанности по подписанию акта об оказании Услуг либо не направления отказа от подписания в течение указанного времени исполнение Услуги признается надлежащим*.” - “The Client is obliged to: obtain Service through signing the act of Service delivery or refuse to sign the act of Service delivery through sending motivated refusal in 5 (five) calendar days from the date written in paragraph 1.1 of present Contract. In case of not signing the act of Service delivery by the Client or not sending refusal in time mentioned Service delivery is meant to be completed”. There are full repetitions in this fragment (the act of Service delivery, Service), root repetitions (signings – sign) and repetitions of word combinations (signing the act of Service delivery – refuse to sign the act of Service delivery) which make the document precise and understood perfectly. It should be noted that it is not allowed to use synonyms or pronouns instead of full repetition to avoid misunderstanding. Despite high concentration of repetitions, this text is not difficult to read and is not overloaded.

Repetition is known to be the most frequently used tool of lexical cohesion in official communication, it can be found in all kinds of documents having been analyzed, including documents made by naive language speakers like business letters, applications, and complaints: 1) “*Вся внутренняя система отопления находится на обслуживании школы. Обслуживание и ремонт системы отопления на должном уровне службы школы осуществить не могут, т.к. нет нужных запасных частей, механизмов и штатных сотрудников этого профиля;*” - “All central heating system is maintained by the school. Maintenance and repairing of the central heating system at an appropriate level cannot be provided by the services of the school because of absence of necessary parts, mechanisms and personnel of this field”; 2) “*Прошу предоставить выписку из Единого государственного реестра юридических лиц <...> Выписка необходима для открытия расчетного счета*” - “I am asking for the extract from «The Unified state catalogue of legal units» <...> The extract is necessary for bank account establishing”.

In addition, it was found that repetition is frequently used in various lists with exact data (sums, quantities, technical characteristics), e.g.: 1) “*На склад поступила бланкета <...> по счету № 879 на сумму 8945 руб.<...> Прошу Вас оплатить остаток по счету №879 в сумме 8945 руб. и получить инструмент*” - “We have received machinery according to the bill № 879, the sum is 8945 rubbles. It is necessary to pay according to the bill №879 the sum 8945 rubbles and get the instrument”; 2) “*Дополнительные требования к изготавливаемому валу: 1. Радиальное биение корпуса вала (без установки на вал клиньев) <...>*” - “Extra characteristics to the shaft: 1. Radial runout of the shaft body (without wedges) is <...> 2. Radial runout of the shaft body (with wedges) is <...>”. The use of repetition helps recipient to obtain and understand all the information given and avoid asking questions. The examples above have various repetition cases (*внутренняя система отопления* - central heating system, *школы* - the school, *по счету №879, 8945 руб.* - according to the bill № 879, 8945 rubbles, *радиальное биение вала* - radial runout of the shaft body, *клинья* - wedges; root repetition (“*обслуживание* - *службы*”- “maintain” – “maintenance”) contribute to linkage of sentences and make texts cohesive, providing the theme coherence as well. Extensive use of lexical repetitions proves high effectiveness of this cohesion type in written business communication and this aspect is clear for document authors.

It should be pointed out that too much use of repetitions is not always good for text perception: “*09.04.99 г. Взял справку для оформления субсидии, но ее не приняли. 02.07.99 г. После отпуска. Оформил справку, опять не правильно, не приняли. Съездил дооформил и опять не приняли. 14.09.99 г. Четвертая справка, наконец-то приняли. 09.09.99 г. Не смог встать на учет в центре занятости центрального района, не правильно оформлены документы. 14.09.99 г. Встал на учет. 16.09.99 г. Справка неправильно оформлена бухгалтером N. Последний раз препятствовала выдаче документов; получил документы с помощью начальника отдела образования. Ни одна справка не была оформлена как надо, при увольнении не оформлены документы на*

*пенсию и в трудовой нет приказа увольнения.*” - “09.04.99. I’ve ordered the certificate for subsidy but it was not accepted. 02.07.99. After holiday. I’ve got the certificate, it was not correct again, it wasn’t accepted. I’ve made changes, and it wasn’t accepted again. 14.09.99. The fourth certificate, it was accepted at last. 09.09.99. Couldn’t be registered in Employment center of the Central district, the documents were not correct. 14.09.99. Was registered. 16.09.99. The certificate wasn’t made correctly by accountant N who interrupted correct document making last time; got the documents with the help of the director of Education department. None of the documents were made correctly, no correct retirement documents, and no order for retirement”. High cohesion in this fragment is provided by the repetitions, but the number of them is too high, and concentrated repetitions interfere understanding of the text: the word “*справка*” - “certificate” can be found there four times, “*документы/-ов*”- “document(s)” – five, “*правильно*” - “correct(ly)” – six, “*приняли*” - “accepted” – four times. The repetition of dates is also disrupting and draws recipient’s attention more than the text itself.

## 2) Cohesion through Relations of Identity

Relations of identity, except lexical repetition, include repetition of semantics, i.e. synonyms. However, the important characteristic of official style and text is absence of synonyms as documents are necessary to be lexically similar and precise. So that lexical repetition is used instead of synonyms. Such rule is connected with the ability of synonyms to change the meaning and bring connotations that should not happen in a text with the highest exactness and terminology.

Despite this, synonyms can be found in texts of operative documents (office memorandum) where situation can be described with less of formality. Consider the example: “*Было бы здорово передать подготовку следующих выпусков сборника на профессиональную кафедру, что значительно повысило бы качественный уровень этого издания*” - “It would be great to pass preparation of the following magazines to a professional department that would increase the quality of this publication”. There are two synonyms in this fragment: “*сборник*”- “*издание*” - “magazines” – “publication” and meaning of the former is included in the meaning of the latter: publication can include any type of printed information, not only magazine. Besides, the synonym does not break the characteristics of the official style as has no emotional connotations and the meaning is clear.

The rest of synonyms that were met during our analysis belong to the type of context synonyms when meanings are connected in one certain text, e.g. 1) “*<...> принято решение учредить с 1 января 2001 г. ежегодный членский взнос <...> Деньги следует переводить до 1 декабря каждого года на расчетный счет МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова (реквизиты прилагаются). Сумма перевода рассчитывается по следующей формуле <...>*” - “<...> the decision was made to organize membership fee from January 1, 2001 annual membership fee is N rubbles. The money should be transferred every year until December 1 to the bank account of MSU named after M.V. Lomonosov (requisites are included). The sum of money is calculated with the following formula <...>; 2) “*Просьба отгрузить УВП, оплаченные нами по Вашему счету <...> В накладной, в графе № 4*

«Особые заявления и отметки» обязательно надо указать непосредственного получателя груза <...>» - “Could you, please, ship the equipment paid according your bill №N? In column № 4 «Comments» of the consignment note it is necessary to write the name of the company which will get the cargo”. In the given examples the words “членский взнос” – “деньги” – “перевод” - “membership fee” – “the money” – “the sum of money” and “УВП (устройства вытяжные пылеулавливающие)” – “груз” - “equipment” – “cargo” are context synonyms, and out of the context they are not in the line of synonyms of each other.

It should be added that if text is written by naive native speaker (e.g. texts of complaints), the use of synonyms can have another role. In this case, the text becomes emotional and cannot belong to the official style, and the reason of this could be highly emotional state of the author or absence of skills of writing in official style. The example provides us with this: “У одной официантки без имени (бело-черные волосы) 2ю неделю ПМС, судя по тому как она всем грубила, огрызалась и шипела «Вы остаетесь?! Если остаетесь – берите меню!»” - “One waitress without a name (blond and black hair) has some problems with nerve, as we can see from her being rude, barking and hissing «Are you going to stay?! If yes – take the menu!»”. There is a line of stylistic synonyms: “грубила” – “огрызалась” – “шипела” - “being rude” – “barking” – “hissing”. The word “зрывать” - “being rude” is marked stylistically neutral; “огрызаться” - “bark” and “шипеть” - “hiss”, in contrast, have connotations and are firstly use to describe animals’ voice activity, they can be used in description of people in figurative sense. The use of words in figurative sense is not a characteristic of official texts, and such cohesion in the example above can be justified only by the author’s emotions in the moment of writing.

Summing up, the scale of repetitions’ types can be made basing on their appropriateness in the official style and revealing main stylistic treats (exactness, clearance, absence of emotions): full repetition – pronominal reference – semantic synonyms – context synonyms – stylistic synonyms. Repetition and pronominal reference, in contrast to synonymy, meet the requirements of official style, and synonymy adds unwanted colors of meanings that can mislead the recipient.

In spite of our highlighting the negative role of synonyms in official text, there can be real examples how this cohesion type helps operative documents. As K. Kozhevnikova noted, relations of identity can be expressed the other way: these are situations when lexical units relate to not a single world but a part of text. In a document as a rule these are cliché “в связи со сложившейся / описанной ситуацией” - “because of current / described situation”, “в связи с изложенным выше” - “in connection to the facts mentioned above”, etc, and they can relate to the short part of the text, its paragraph of the whole text itself. Such examples can be found in memorandums or business letters. In this case, the conclusion of the text points to its previous parts, and their meaning are included in word combinations: 1) “Довожу до Вашего сведения, что в связи со сложившейся ситуацией занятия срываются на протяжении уже трех дней” - “I would like to tell you that the lessons are disrupted because of the reasons described above”; 2) “В связи с изложенным прошу не применять

штрафных санкций по отношению к кафедре русского языка и литературы” - “Because of this, I ask you not to punish the Department of Language and Literature”.

### 3) Cohesion through Relations of Inclusion

The next type of lexical cohesion considered in our work – relations of inclusion that show, firstly, the relations of concepts with different size of meaning and are represented in language by hypo and hyperonymic paradigm which is a way to organize nominative units that are grouped together by common concept. Secondly, it is lexic and semantic field where lexemes are united on the base of archiseme.

The first variant of these relations can be found in the following example from memorandum: “В связи с необходимостью обеспечения качественной подготовки студентов по ряду специальностей гуманитарного факультета, в частности, филологии <...> и регионоведения (преподавание восточных языков – китайского, корейского, японского) кафедры вынуждены привлекать специалистов из других вузов, СМИ, предприятий города <...>” - “Due to necessity of qualified students training in the list of specialties on the Faculty of Humanities, in particular, Philology and Regional Studies (Asian languages teaching – Chinese, Korean, Japanese) the departments have to attract specialists from other higher educational institutions, media, city companies <...>”. There is hyperonym “восточные языки” - “Asian languages” and hyponyms – substantive “китайский, корейский, японский” - “Chinese, Korean, Japanese”, the use of which are determined by necessity to specify details: which teachers are needed.

Some documents written by naive native speakers have different types of cohesive relations at the same time: inclusive and identical, e.g. “К моему глубокому сожалению, город меня разочаровал своей нечистоплотностью. Грязь повсюду: на остановках общественного транспорта, в парках, подъездах домов и т.д. Выбрали для проживания один из самых зеленых микрорайонов города – жилмассив N. <...> Конечная остановка общественного транспорта «NN» ежедневно завалена мусором, который оставляют, по большей части, водители маршруток. Они здесь перекусывают в перерывах между рейсами. После них горы одноразовых стаканчиков, окурки и прочий мусор, который они выбрасывают прямо из окон автобусов” - “It was a pity for me that the city disappointed me with its untidiness. Dirt is everywhere: on the bus stops, in parks, entrances of houses, etc. We have chosen one of the greenest districts of the city – residential N. <...> The final bus stop «NN» is daily covered with litter, which is dropped mainly by taxi drivers. They have dinner here between their rides. There are hills of disposable plastic glasses, butts and other litter that they throw away out of their windows”. In this fragment, “мусор” - “litter” is hyperonym, and “пластиковые стаканчики” - “plastic glasses” and “окурки” - “butts” are hyponyms. Moreover, the hyperonym is in a pair of semantic synonyms “мусор – грязь” - “litter – dirt”, and all the words mentioned are included in the lexic and semantic field “нечистоплотность” - “untidiness”. All these details enriches the message, specifying the hyperonym semantics. Lexical and semantic field “город” - “the city” including places in the city (“остановки” - “bus stops”, “парки” - “parks”, “подъезды” -

“entrances”, “микрорайон” - “district”, “жилмассив” “residential”) also helps to achieve the same goal of detailing. Such lexical diversity causes tight cohesion of fragments in the text and contributes to clear expression and understanding of the meaning. From the point of view of the document author, this way of expressing his/her ideas is the most suitable and effective for the recipient to take necessary actions and change the situation. However, there is one irregularity in this example: it is not concise, and conciseness is one of the main characteristics of the official style: excess and too many details contradict information shortness, which is also among the crucial traits of official documents.

#### 4) Cohesion through Relations of Exclusion

One more type of lexical cohesion is relations of exclusion that are found in text – opposites. There are no opposites in the professionally written documents analyzed, and it can be caused by the kind of information given in a document: there is no need to show contrast, confronting sides. Nevertheless, having analyzed documents made by naive native speakers we noticed that there are opposites in memorandums and complaints, but in the use of opposites in these texts is correct. Opposites can maintain relations of contrast and comparison between predicative parts of a sentence. Comparative relations can be found in the following example from the memorandum: : “<...> Записи в журнале подтверждают, что ключ от 502 был вчера, 19.05., а сегодня взят техничкой, запись в журнале «охраны» – 6-20 час. <...>” - “<...> Notes in a security journal confirm that the key from the room №502 was there yesterday, 19.05., and today it was taken by the janitor, the note from the journal – 6-20 a.m.”. Contradictory opposites “вчера” – “сегодня” - “yesterday” – “today” contribute to show the contrast situation (the key loss) of two different days. In addition, the next fragment also has exclusive cohesion tools (“правый” – “левый” - “right” – “left”, “легковой” – “грузовой”, “automobile” – “truck”): “Машины, которым нужно следовать по правой стороне дороги, по направлению к гостинице «Геолог», проезжают по левой, так как там дорога песок – обкатана <...> Детям играть негде: машины движутся по «бетонке», бывает с огромной скоростью, и не только легковые машины, но и грузовые, КамАЗы, и проч.” - “Cars which are to move the right side of the road towards the “Geologist” hotel drive the left side because the road is more comfortable there <...> Children have nowhere to play: cars are moving with high speed, and not only automobiles, trucks, etc too”.

In addition, another type of opposites is widely used in documents written by naive native speakers. The opposite is derived with adding “не” - “no-/non-” to the contrast word: “Мы сельские учителя, работаем в Евсинской средней школе. Сейчас пенсионеры-инвалиды. Живем в неблагоустроенной квартире. <...> У нас основная масса учителей (~ 60 чел.) живут в благоустроенных квартирах, где прекрасные условия”. - “We are teachers from the country, work in Evsinskaya school. Now we are pensioners with disabilities. We live in a non-comfortable flat. The majority of our teachers (~ 60 persons) lives in comfortable flats with perfect conditions”. The use of such easily derived opposites makes the process of writing and understanding the text easier; moreover, this kind of opposites is a simple one to create.

Thus, antonyms are typical for the documents created by naive native speakers. It is caused by genre: the situations described in such documents have negative information, and the author has a perfect view of the situation that he/she wants to give in contrast.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Summing up, lexical type of cohesion is one of the main kinds of cohesion in official documents. In addition, lexical repetition is found to be the most widely used type of lexical cohesion in documents. The use of this type of cohesion is widespread in the official documents written by native speakers with special training in this sphere and without it, but the concentration of repetition is different. We can conclude that the repetition itself is caught by naive metalinguistic consciousness, and native speakers realize that it helps to increase the accuracy of the text and make its meaning clearer.

Despite understanding of the repetition importance, the documents we have analyzed showed that native speakers tend to use it more than is needed. One of the repetition types, pronoun reference that implicate itself through pronouns of generalizing meaning, mostly used in the end of the documents. Another kind of identity relations – synonyms – is an unusual thing for official documents as its use is restricted by the style. However, sometimes one can find semantic or context synonyms in texts of formal letters.

Inclusive and exclusive relations are represented in official documents as hypo-hyperonym paradigms, lexical and semantic fields and opposites. These relations can be found rarely and characterize non-professional operational documents such as applications, complaints, and office memorandums. Presence and proper use of such relations contribute to clear description of situation, however it can break shortness, an essential characteristic of official style. All the cases of irregularities appear because native speakers without special professional training in official documents writing do not realize all the peculiarities of official texts and consequently do not include them in texts.

#### References

- [1] O.I. Blinova, “Naive metalinguistic consciousness as a source of linguistic information (based on dialect motivity)” in Naive metalinguistic consciousness and naive linguistics / ed. by A.N. Rostova, Kemerovo, Barnaul, Altay Univ. Publ., 2008 – pp. 13-19.
- [2] N.D. Golev, “Modern Russian naive metalinguistic consciousness between science and school Russian language course (“Correctness” as a base of naive linguistics),” in Naive metalinguistic consciousness: ontological and gnoseological aspects / ed. by E.V. Kishina, E.V. Bateneva, Tomsk, 2009, vol. 2, pp. 378-409.
- [3] D.Y. Polinichenko, M.S. Burkhanova, “Amateurish linguistic concepts in modern Russia (based on work of M.N. Zadornov)”, NB: Philological research, Moscow, 2013, № 2. - pp. 67-81.
- [4] A.N. Rostova, “Naive metalinguistic consciousness: status and aspects of research”, Naive metalinguistic consciousness and naive linguistics, Kemerovo, Barnaul, Altay Univ. Publ., 2008 – pp. 49-57.
- [5] N.V. Bugorskaya, “Naive language philosophy: two styles of academic writing” in Naive metalinguistic consciousness: ontological and gnoseological aspects / ed. by N.D.Golev, Tomsk, 2009, vol. 2, pp. 214-227.
- [6] N.A. Kuzmina, “Autocomments as demonstration of metalinguistic consciousness (based on Russian poetry of the modern time)” in Naive

- metalinguistics consciousness: ontological and gnoseological aspects / ed. by N.D.Golev, Tomsk, 2009, vol. 2, pp. 279-304.
- [7] N.A. Nikolina, "Metalinguistic reflection in modern poetic speech" in Naive metalinguistics consciousness: ontological and gnoseological aspects / ed. by N.D.Golev, Tomsk, 2009, vol. 2, pp.336-353.
- [8] M.R. Shumarina, "Language in the mirror of literary text" Metalinguistic reflection in Russian prose / ed.by N.A. Nikolina, Moscow, FLINTA, Nauka, 2011, p. 328.
- [9] A.A. Dyakova, "Objective and subjective difficulty of documents", Journal of VolSU, Series 2, Linguistics, № 1 (30), Volgograd, 2016, pp. 63-69.
- [10] M.V. Slautina, "Lexial category "Document" in cognitive aspect", Journal of VolSU, Series 2, Linguistics, № 1 (30), Volgograd, 2016, pp. 82-86.
- [11] O.P. Sologub, "Russian business text in the functional genetic aspect", Novosibirsk, NSTU Publ., 2008.
- [12] T.V. Milevskaya, "Coherence as category of discourse and text (cognitive, fuctional and communicative-pragmatic aspect)", Rostov-on-Done, 2003a, p.42.
- [13] N.N. Leontyeva, "Component of common semantics in system of understanding of text", Scripta linguisticae applicatae. Problems of applied linguistics / ed. by N.V. Vasilyeva, Moscow: Azbukovnik, 2001.
- [14] E.V. Shpar, "Main problems of studying textual cohesion in Russian linguistics", Communicative and functional description of language, Ufa, 2003, p.223.
- [15] V.A. Lukin, "Literary style: bases of linguistics theory and elements of analysis", Moscow, Os'-89, 1999.
- [16] T.V. Milevskaya, "Coherence as category of discourse and text (cognitive, fuctional and communicative-pragmatic aspect)", autoabstract for PhD diss., Rostov-on-Done, 2003b, p.13, 25-26.
- [17] Y.A. Nazaruk, "Cohesion category from the point of view of textual second nomination", Journal of SamSU, 2006, №10/2 (50), pp. 197-203.
- [18] L.M. Androsova, "Tools of implicative cohesion in textual surface structure," in Language as a functional system: Articles for N.A. Kobrina anniversary / ed. by N.N. Boldyres et al., Tambov: Tambov university, 2001.