

УДК 811.112.2'367.4

DISCOURSE PARTICLE IN SL AND TL COMPARED**Mykhaylenko Valery V.**

Дане дослідження зосереджено на функціональній семантиці, дистрибуції та прагматиці частки типу I THINK у структурі дискурсу, представленого текстом оригіналу та текстом перекладу. Кінцева мета – вирізнити коректність сприйняття перекладачем передбачуваного автором значення частки для встановлення спільних рис в обох текстах. Проаналізовано велику кількість термінів для одного і того ж явища. Визначено регулярні трансформації зазначеної 'частки' при перекладі з англійської мови на російську. Напрями подальшого дослідження окреслено.

Ключові слова: дискурс, частка, маркер, мова оригіналу, мова перекладу, авторське значення, функція, прагматика, порівняння.

Данное исследование сосредоточено на функциональной семантике, дистрибуции и прагматике частицы типа I THINK в структуре дискурса, представленного текстом оригинала и текстом перевода. Конечная цель – установить корректность восприятия переводчиком авторского значения частицы, для установления их общих черт в обоих текстах. Проанализировано большое количество терминов, обозначающих одно и то же явление. Определены регулярные трансформации указанной 'частицы' при переводе с английского на русский. Обозначены перспективы дальнейшего исследования объекта.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, частица, маркер, язык оригинала, язык перевода, авторское значение, функция, прагматика, сравнение.

The present paper is focused on the functional semantics, distribution, and pragmatics of the discourse pragmatic particle of I THINK type in the discourse structure of the Source Language and the Target Language. The end-goal is to reveal the Translator's appropriate comprehension of the Author's intended meaning to prove the common grounding of the particles. A great variety of terms for the same phenomenon is surveyed. The regular transformations are defined. And further investigations of discourse pragmatic particles are suggested.

Key-words: discourse, particle, marker, source language, target language, intended meaning, function, pragmatics, comparison.

STATE OF THE ART

So far the term 'discourse marker' differs in meaning from one group of scholars to another, and one can come across DMs under a variety of labels [see a detailed overview of the term: 12, p. 931– 952; 24, p. 367– 381], for instance, cue phrases/discourse markers (A. Knott and R. Dale, 1994), discourse connectives (D. Blakemore, 1987, 1992), pragmatic markers (expressed by adverbials, conjunctions, interjections and comment clauses Laurel J. Brinton, 1996) /discourse operators (G. Redeker, 1990, 1991), discourse particles (L. Schourup, 1999), discourse signalling devices (L. Polanyi and R. Scha, 1983), phatic connectives (C. Bazanella, 1990), discourse connectors / pragmatic connectives (M. Stubbs, 1983), pragmatic expressions (B. Erman, 1992), pragmatic formatives (B. Fraser, 1987), pragmatic markers (B. Fraser, 1988, 1990; D. Schiffrin, 1987), pragmatic operators (M. Ariel, 1994), pragmatic particles (J. Ostman, 1995), semantic conjuncts (R. Quirk et al., 1985), sentence connectives (M. Halliday and A. Hasan, 1976). G. Redeker, 1991 calls discourse markers (DM) discourse operators: "... a word or phrase that is uttered with the primary function of bringing to the listener's attention, a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context, an utterance in this definition is an intonationally and structurally bounded, usually a clausal unit." G. Redeker (1991), A. Zwicky (1985) point out that within a great number of 'language units labeled as particles', they distinguished 'one grammatically significant class of items termed 'discourse particles' and 'interjections' but they referred them to 'discourse markers' which may form a separate class on the

grounds of 'distribution, prosody, and meaning'. But like the 'particles' discussed ... "they are independent words rather than clitics ..." [27, p. 303]. D. Shiffrin researches the functions of discourse markers which must include a coherence function [24, p. 326]. She makes it clear that coherence is "constructed through relations between adjacent units in discourse" and claims that there are five distinct and separate planes, each with its own type of coherence Exchange Structure, Action Structure, Ideational Structure, Participation Framework, and Participation Framework" [24, p. 24-25]. B. Fraser approaches discourse markers from a grammatical-pragmatic perspective and first called them "pragmatic formatives" and later "pragmatic markers" [cf.: B. Fraser, 1996]. These are pragmatic markers expressed by lexical units (originated from conjunctions, adverbials, and prepositional phrases) which do not contribute to the propositional content of the sentence they signal different types of messages only. He also underlines that they serve to link the given sentence with the preceding and the following sentences. B. Fraser stresses that their core meaning is procedural, not conceptual [cf. 1; 2, p. 146–150].

There are still two main tendencies in the investigation of particles/markers/operators/connectors: (1) in the lexical-grammatical class of particles [see: 14, p. 432 and other traditional grammarians] and (2) in the paradigm (field) of discourse markers/operators/connectors/particles [Laurel J. Brinton, 2010; L. Schourup 1999; A. Zwicky, 1985; D. Shiffrin, 1987; B. Fraser, 1987; L. Schourup, 1999; V. Mykhaylenko, 2015-2016]. In the most recent research of discourse markers M.B. Каменський proposes to organize them into the conceptual field of 'cognitive load', a mental construct of personal nature representing individual experience of comprehending objective reality [1, p. 146-150; 2].

INTRODUCTION

A *discourse particle* is a word or phrase used in discourse to signal the speaker's intention to mark a boundary revealing various functional semantic components in its distribution: (1) starting a conversation or talk; (2) ending a conversation; (3) ordering what we say; (4) changing or managing a topic; (5) monitoring what we say; (6) saying something in another way; (7) sharing knowledge; (8) showing attitude; (9) making speech less direct; (10) responding. Accordingly, Edison Hajiev introduces his classification of discourse particles: limiting, intensifying, additive, negative, and connecting [14, p. 432-433].

The traditional term 'particle' is not appropriate, because it coincides with the particle as a part of speech which has its lexical grammatical meaning of "emphatic specification"; unilateral combinability with words of different classes, groups of words, even clauses; and function of a specifier [14, p. 432], besides most particles are homonymous with other parts of speech (adverbs, adjectives, pronouns, nouns, verbs, interjections, statives, conjunctions, prepositions). Evidentially, discourse markers are more common in informal speech than in most forms of writing. The term 'marker' also lost its novelty and still bears some associations with differential, morphological, syntactical, semantic, pragmatic, cohesive, etc. phenomena. Evidentially, while the process of transition of modal adverbs [see: 3] to discourse modal units is under way and phrases and sentences are being joined to them we will retain the traditional label of particles expecting a corresponding term to be created.

Among discourse particles the most common are *okay, anyway, like, right, fine, good, now, great, oh, so, well, perhaps, and then, first (of all), firstly, for a start, in general, in the end, last of all, next, sum up, absolutely, certainly, definitely, exactly, really, sure, clearly, confidentially, apparently amazingly, basically, certainly, probably, definitely, confidentially, maybe*, etc. We are interested in the syntactical units which on the surface level are predicative construction –its modality includes the verb mood, for instance: *You know, I mean, I see, you see, mind you, what is more, that's great/interesting/amazing/awful, if you ask me, I'm afraid, I must admit, I must say, (I'm) sorry*, etc. Their sentence modality also includes the category of mood of the verb-predicate which expresses the relationship between the process denoted by the verb and actual reality, either presenting the process as a fact that really happened, happens or will happen, or treating it as an imaginary phenomenon [4, p. 202-220]. We believe that in the object of the present study: *I think* in the Source Text of "The Litigators" by John Grisham the verb *think* expresses the referred relationship.

Originally think comes from Old English þencan "imagine, conceive in the mind; consider, meditate, remember; intend, wish, desire", probably originally "cause to appear to oneself" taking its roots from Proto-Germanic *thankjan, cf. its cognates: Old Frisian thinka, Old Saxon thenkian, Old High German denchen, Modern German denken, Old Norse þekkja, and Gothic þagkjan. The Old English þencan is the causative form of the distinct Old English verb þyncan "to seem, to appear" from Proto-Germanic *thankjan (cognates: German dünken, dächte). Both are from PIE *tong- "to think, feel" It must be preserved in in archaic methinks "it seems to me." The semantic structure of the Old English verb þyncan, tr. includes the following components: "to have or formulate in the mind; to reason about or reflect on; ponder; to decide by reasoning, reflection, or pondering; to judge or regard; look upon; to believe; suppose; to expect; hope; to intend; to call to mind; remember; to visualize; imagine; to devise or evolve; invent; to bring into a given condition by mental preoccupation; to concentrate one's thoughts on, to exercise the power of reason, as by conceiving ideas, drawing inferences, and using judgment; to weigh or consider an idea; to bring a thought to mind by imagination or invention; to recall a thought or an image to mind; to believe; suppose; to have care or consideration" [OED], from the point of the modern usage in the construction 'I think' the component to 'suppose' must be dominant [cf.: Ursula Lutzky, 2012].

Let's compare the semantic structure of the modern verb think "believe something; have an opinion or idea; to consider a person's needs or wishes: to use the brain to decide to do something; to think very carefully about something; think aloud UK (US think out loud)", where the component 'believe something or have an opinion or idea' must be dominant in our case.

Discourse markers can be considered as connectors or discourse coherence markers: authors with their help marks how the coming sentence or clause relates back to previous discourse and how they spread their modal component over the following text.

INVESTIGATION

We will retrieve contexts from the novel 'Litigators' by John Grisham (the original text and its Russian translation) representing Grisham's discourse, term 'discourse analysis' is very ambiguous. We will refer it mainly to the linguistic analysis of coherent spoken or written discourse consisting of coherent/ cohesive linguistic units above the sentence. The speech continuum (a succession of sentences/utterances, sequential relations) occurs in social contexts, wherein interaction or dialogue between speakers. M. Stubbs defines discourse analysis as (a) concerned with language use beyond the boundaries of a sentence/utterance, (b) concerned with the interrelationships between language and society and (c) as concerned with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication [26, p. 131]. Discourse analysis [see: 13] does not presuppose a bias towards the study of either spoken or written language. Gisela Redeker considers the theory of discourse to be the central point of discourse analysis: "how people signal and recognize structural units in discourse and how they identify connecting links between those units" [23, p. 367]. She chose conjunctives in pragmatic use, interjections in connective use and comment clauses ('I mean', 'You know' registered mainly in dialogue) in discourse-structuring use as pragmatic discourse markers. The clauses are interpreted as current speaker's own additions serving as 'enquoting device' [23, p. 373-375; see also: 25, p. 227– 265]. On the contrary, B. Fraser does not refer 'pseudo-sentences' like *I think* to the class of pragmatic (free morphemes, discourse-segment initial) which signal a specific message, and are classified not syntactically but in terms of their semantic/pragmatic functions [21, p. 931-952]. Elise Kärkkäinen offers a micro-analysis of prosody of *I think*, the prototypical stance marker, as a discourse marker [16, p. 105-115].

Primarily translation is based on the common features and then on the differential ones. Here is an advantage of making a distinction between comparative and contrastive types to build a theory discourse markers in every language on the features common at least for the both languages.

In the sentences with the notional transitive verb *think* there is a complementizer *THAT*:

[SL] Main Clause + THAT+ Object Clause, e.g.:

1.–I was thinking, Wally, THAT maybe we could make some other arrangements. – You know, just me and you.

1.1. – Я тут подумала, Уолли, может, нам удастся договориться по-другому. – Только вы и я, понимаете?

2. – For what? Working a hundred hours a week? I thought THAT was the norm around here. --I think all of you people need to see a shrink.”

2.1. – Я думала, здесь это норма. Тогда вам всем нужно показаться психиатру.

In (1–2) text fragments the complementizer follows the transitive verb-predicate of the principle clause and precedes the object one. In English the verb *think*, tr. is mainly the sentence predicate. In the TT (1.1.-2.1.) the verb *think* retains its sentence predicate function and it is transferred into the Russian verb *думать*, the complementizer THAT is not transferred into Russian to simplify the sentence structure of the sentence in oral speech: **[SL] Main Clause + THAT+ Object Clause → [TL] Main Clause + Object Clause**

The following text fragments demonstrate the development of the discourse particle function by the verb *think*, itr.:

[SL] Pseudo-Clause → [TL] Discourse Particle + Simple Sentence

In the SL (3–7) there are some specific features of the pseudo-clause *I think*:

(1) distributional – it is used in the preposition to the whole sentence as a regular sentential pragmatic adverb [see: 22]; (2) pragmatic –the attitudinal meaning of *I think* spreads over the scope of the following sentence it – spreads over the speaker’s continuum; (3) communicative – the change of roles: SPEAKER → HEARER → SPEAKER → ...; and (4) coherent/cohesive [see:17, p. 35–62] (organizational or supportive) – it links the given speech continuum with the previous speech continuum, e.g.:

3. – You’re not fine. You’re drunk and you’re cracking up. –Okay, I may be drunk but... –I think I hear Roy Barton again. –What should I tell him?

3.1.–Вроде, опять звонит Рой Бартон. –Что ему сказать?

In the TL (3.1.) *I think* is transferred as a sentential modal particle *вроде* (Slovar russkogo yazyka Dalya) in the preposition to the whole sentence and it is separated by comma, see also:

4. – I think I’ll stay with the car, David said. – You can handle this one by yourself.

4.1. – Пожалуй, я останусь в машине, - заявил Дэвид. – Там ты и один справишься.

SL *I think* is transferred into a modal TL particle *пожалуй* (Slovar russkogo yazyka Dalya)

5. – Can we see a lawyer without an appointment? the man asked. – I think so, Rochelle said. They backed into the chairs and sat down, then both managed to scoot the chairs farther away from each other. This could get ugly, Rochelle thought. She pulled out a questionnaire and found a pen. – Your names, please. – Full names.

5.1. – А можно встретиться с юристом без предварительной записи? – поинтересовался мужчина. –Думаю, да, – ответила Рошель.

In (5.1.) it is transferred as a simple sentence, see: communicative feature (3) and it plays the linking role (see: feature 4), but the pragmatic meaning of attitude is not limited by this very sentence. See also:

6. –I’m Figg. He’s Finley. Are you a lawyer? – I think so. As of eight o’clock this morning I was employed by Rogan Rothberg, one of six hundred.

6.1. – Думаю, да. Сегодня в восемь утра я еще работал в фирме "Роган Ротберг", был одним из шестисот сотрудников.

7. – Do you think it’s fair?” she asked.

7.1. – А вы полагаете, это справедливо? – спросила она.

In (7.1.) the verb *think* is transferred with the help of its synonym which actualizes its meaning of “to seem, to appear” (Slovar russkogo yazyka Dalya)

in the present context. Additionally, it has features (1–4), see also:

8. –She looks familiar. –Yep, she was here about a year ago, second or third divorce. – Same dress, I think.

8.1. – В том же самом платье, кажется.

Here the attitudinal component is well-illustrated by the final position of *I THINK* revealing its supportive function in the dialogue speech.

9. – The old man was too smart. She lives in a penthouse on the lake, comes in every day at eleven, has three Pearl Harbors for lunch, leaves at 12:15 when the crowd comes in, and I guess she goes home and sleeps it off. –I think she's cute."

9.1. --По-моему, она милая.

The (9) "pseudo-clause" *I THINK* [19, p. 247– 251] is grammaticalized into a discourse pragmatic particle. The translator's comprehension helped him to transfer it into a pronominal adverbial (Slovar russkogo yazyka Dalya) used as a sentential pragmatic adverb in (9.1.)

The main method employed in the paper is comparative - a standardized way to compare different languages to determine their relationship. Then it will be supplemented by the contrastive analysis practiced by scholars in search of contrasts distinguishing every language under study.

We must specify that discourse particles do not always have meanings registered in the dictionary. However, they do have certain functions which are actualized in their context. In the framework of discourse theory the role of context is significant – it plays the role of actualizator of the functional semantic components of the language unit.

The linguistic analysis of *I THINK* reveals its common distribution in the initial position of the sentence, however, it loses its structural relationship with it. Pragmatically it spreads its attitudinal meaning over the whole discourse. And communicatively *I THINK* marks the speaker's continuum organizing it, see also: *I see, I mean, I admit*, etc.

CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

The transformation of the SL Pseudo-Clause *I THINK*, first, into a TL sentential pragmatic adverbial is a regularity revealed by the contrastive analysis which describes the structural differences and similarities of English as SL and Russian as TL. Contrastive analysis (CA) is basic for translation studies and presupposes the universals in languages under consideration: 'as in any contrast, if there were no features in common, there would be no foundation for comparison' (Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistic, 1999).

According to our hypothesis a further development of the "pseudo-sentence" of *I THINK* type can be [TL] Pragmatic Discourse Particle (used structurally independently + Sentence, though the facts of Russian as our TL show that formally this particle is still a sentence constituent, that, perhaps, is a TL contrast.

Several ways of researching discourse pragmatic markers in the framework of various linguistic paradigms can be explained by the complexity of their status – their morphological, syntactic, and communicative features are the subject of discussion which requires a comprehensive corpus analysis. So far their contribution to discourse pragmatics does not need any further evidence.

References

1. Каменский М. В. Когнитивно-функциональная модель дискурсных маркеров: автореф. дисс. док. филол. наук: спец.10.02.19 "Теория языка" / М. В. Каменский. – Майкоп, 2015. – 46 с.

2. Каменский М. В. Когнитивно-функциональная классификация дискурсных маркеров (на примере английского языка) [Текст] /М.В.Каменский // Вестник Северо-Кавказского федерального университета. - Ставрополь, 2013. – № 4.(37). –С. 146–150.

3. Сарафанникова Е. В. Дискурсивные маркеры соотношения сообщаемого с действительностью: На материале телевизионных новостей на русском и английском языках: автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук: спец.10.02.19 "Теория языка" / С. В. Сарафанникова. – Воронеж, 2006. – 20с.

4. Штелинг Д. А. Грамматическая семантика и контекст: Фактор человека в языке / Д. А. Штелинг. – М.: МГИМО, ЧеРО, 1996. – 254 с.

5. Alonso Pilar. Aspects of Discourse Analysis/ Pilar Alonso. – Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 2002. –204 p.

6. Ariel M. Pragmatic Operators / M. Ariel // *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. – Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1994. – Pp. 325– 353.
7. Bazanella C. Phatic Connectives as Intonational Cues in Contemporary Spoken Italian / C. Bazanella // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1990. – Vol.14. – Issue 4. –Pp. 629 – 647.
8. Blakemore D. Understanding Utterances / D. Blakemore. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1992. –xi – 191p.
9. Brinton Laurel J. Pragmatic Markers in English. Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions / Laurel J. Brinton. – Berlin. New York: Walter de Gruyter Mouton, 1996. – 412 p.
10. Brinton Laurel J. Discourse Markers / Laurel J. Brinton // Andreas H. Jucker, Irma Taavitsainen (eds.). *Historical Pragmatics*. – Berlin. New York: Walter de Gruyter Mouton, 2010. – Pp.285– 314.
11. Erman B. Pragmatic Markers Revisited with a Focus on *You Know* in Adult and Adolescent Talk / B. Erman // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 2001. – Vol.33. – Pp. 1337 – 1359.
12. Fraser Bruce. What are Discourse Markers? / Bruce Fraser // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1999. –Vol. 31. – Pp.931– 952.
13. Gee James Paul. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method / Paul James Gee. – New York: Routledge, 2009. – 215p.
14. Hajiev Edison. The Status of Particles in Modern English / Edison Hajiev // *International Journal of Computers*. – 2008. – Volume 2. –Issue 4. –Pp. 432–441.
15. Halliday M., Hasan R. Cohesion in English / M.Halliday, R. Hasan. – London: Longman. 1976. –375p.
16. Kärkkäinen Elise. Epistemic Stance in English Conversation: A Description of Its Interactional Functions, with a Focus on “I think” / Elise Kärkkäinen. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2003. –213 p.
17. Knott A. Dale R. Using Linguistic Phenomena to Motivate a Set of Coherence Relations / A. Knott R. Dale // *Discourse Processes*. – 1994. –Vol. 18. – Issue 1. – Pp. 35– 62.
18. Lutzky Ursula. Discourse Markers in Early Modern English / Ursula Lutzky. – New York: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012. – 209 p.
19. Mykhaylenko Valery V. Phatic Utterance in the Author’s Discourse / V. Mykhaylenko // *Актуальні проблеми іноземної філології: Лінгвістика та літературознавство: міжвуз. зб. наук. ст. / гол. ред. В. А. Зарва. – Бердянськ: БДПУ, 2011. – Вип. VI. – Ч.1. – С.247– 251.*
20. Ostman J.-O. Pragmatic Particles Twenty Years After / J.-O. Ostman // B. Warvik et al.(eds.). *Organization in Discourse: Proceedings from the Turku Conference, 1995. // Anglicana Turkuensia – 1995. – Vol.14. – Pp. 95–108.*
21. Polanyi Livia, Scha Remko. Syntax of Discourse / L. Polanyi, Remko Scha // *Text*. –1983. –Vol.3. – Pp.261–270.
22. Quirk R. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik. – London: Longman, 1985. –897 p.
23. Redeker G. Ideational and Pragmatic Markers of Discourse Structure / G. Redeker // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1990, -- 14. –Issue 3. – Pp.367– 381.
24. Schiffrin D. Discourse Markers / D. Shiffrin. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987. –364 p.
25. Schourup L. Discourse markers / L. Schourup // *Lingua*. – 1999. – Volume 107. – Pp.227– 265.
26. Stubbs M. Discourse Analysis. The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language / M. Stubbs. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983. –279 p.
27. Zwicky A. Clitics and Particles / A. Zwicky // *Language* – 1985. – Vol.61 – Pp. 283– 305.