Yu. Verbynenko

DISCOURSE PARTICLES: PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION

Among not fully developed lexical units that control the process of communication (such as modal words, conjunctions, etc.) can be distinguished class of discourse particles. Such language constructs provides text coherence, transfer speaker's attitude to statements, focus one's attention to the context; discourse

particles make statements more clear, structured; regulate emotional coloring, make text clearer [1; 2]. Functions of markers in the context are very wide, amongst them: statement organizing, shifting from one topic to another, text macrostructure expressing, marking of individual point of view, expressing attitude to the statements, its characterizing etc. [3] Such focusing of discourse particles allows to qualify them as units, which provide certain functions of linguistic pragmatics.

At the same time, the number of such units, frequency of their usage and their formal grammatical structure are associated not only with the structure of a particular language but also with speaker's individual linguistic view of the world. All these cause difficulties during their translation. Since language and culture are inseparable, using of foreign languages in isolation from the culture is impossible; the difference between cultures usually has no clear recordings in dictionaries, so researchers point out that cross-language cultural barrier creates additional problems to the lingual communication [1]. All said above becomes especially important in the context of modern scientific communication.

Also it is difficult to describe discourse particles due to that fact that the theory of their semantic description and its lexicographical representation are not developed. There are some difficulties in the forming of dictionary definitions of the units of this class, as they are often integrated into the context. This makes it difficult to define system boundaries of units of this class and to build their correct classification.

Some authors (K. Holker, 1991, L. Brinton, 1996, A. Jucker& Y. Ziv, 1998) had attempted to highlight linguistic units with discourse markers, that are, in particular, referred to phonological, semantic, syntactic, functional, sociolinguistic and stylistic similarities and differences. Later on linguists tried to classify the discourse markers due to their belonging to certain lexical and grammatical classes (prepositions, conjunctions – coordinating and subordinating, interjections, parenthesis, modal particles some adverbs). French linguist Denis Paillard and his colleagues noted the uncertain status of discourse words, and indicated function words as the closest part of speech to which they could be related [4].

However, nowadays there is no even minimally closed list of discursive markers, as well as a complex of their system signs. In the works of foreign scientists various discourse markers and their groups are studied, mainly from the structural and semantic point of view. Thus, different linguists have different opinions concerning what lexical units have to be marked as discourse markers (Rouchota 1998; Schiffrin 1987; Dijk 1977; Blakemore 1992; Vishnevskaya, Lihareva 2000, Tyurina 2003) [5].

The problems of polysemy and polyfunctionality of discourse particles are also academically interesting. But attention to these problem was not given in dictionaries and grammars; and they did not get rightful place in discourse particles descriptions [6].

Thus, it is obvious that there is lack of theoretical and, especially, lexicographical works on linguopragmatics of discursive particles, and there are almost no works that presented Ukrainian language. In Ukrainian lexicography A. Luchyk studies similar problems ("Words equivalents in Ukrainian", "Russian-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Russian dictionary of word equivalents").

E. Khachaturyan in [7] notes that many discourse particles also have non-discourse meaning. But it is difficult to find a correlation between them. Linguists' thoughts about these particles are differs greatly. Such scientists as B. Fraser think that there are homonyms relationships between two identical units, that "pragmatic meanings of discourse markers are not relate to the meanings of homonymous forms" (Fraser, p. 389). Others divide lexical units, which meanings are determined by meanings of their "semantic relatives", and lexical units, which meanings are not dependent from their homonymous forms meanings.

However, recent studies are more and more clear formulate an idea that there is a correlation between semantics of discourse particles and semantics of lexical words, which allows to talk about forming of discursive particles through partial desemantization.

For example:

1. Скажем (допустим) / **Скажімо** (припустимо)

Discourse meaning:

If the state of a system is changed, **as by** heating, the values of its state functions change too.

Если состояние системы изменится, **скажем**, при нагревании, значения его функций состояния тоже изменятся.

Якщо стан системи зміниться, **скажімо**, при нагріванні, значення його функцій стану теж зміняться.

Сказать (что-л.) / **Сказати** (що-н.)

Non-discourse meaning:

It seems impossible **tosay anything against** such a point of view.

Кажется, невозможно **сказать** ничего против такой точки зрения.

Здається, неможливо **сказати** нічого проти такої точки зору.

2. Допустим (предположим) / **Припустимо**

Discourse meaning:

Let us assume that the situation is represented by a triangle.

Допустим, что эту ситуацію можно представить в виде треугольника.

Припустимо, що цю ситуацію можна представити у вигляді трикутника.

Допускать (позволять)

Non-discourse meaning:

The X-ray tube current **should not beallowed to** exceed 80 μA.

В рентгеновской трубке **нельзя допускать** превышение тока выше 80 μA.

У рентгенівській трубці **не можна допускати** перевищення струму вище 80 μA.

3. Другими *словами* / **Інакше кажучи**

Discourse meaning:

– **In other words**, we observe evidence of a bimodal relationship.

Другими словами, мы наблюдаем свидетельство бимодальных отношений.

Інакше кажучи, ми спостерігаємо підтвердження бімодальних відношень.

Non-discourse meaning:

He had said this **in other words**, not the way you has said this just now.

Он говорил это **другими словами**, не так, как ты сейчас пересказала.

Він говорив це **іншими словами**, не так, як ти зараз переказала.

4. *В любом* **случае** / *У будь-якому* **разі**

Discourse meaning:

– Such separation may, **in any case**, not be possible.

В любом случае, такое разделение не представляется возможным.

У будь-якому разі, такий поділ не представляється можливим.

Non-discourse meaning:

You know how to behave in **any possible case**.

Ты знаеш как себя вести **в любом случае** из возможных.

Ти знаєш як себе поводити **в будь-якому випадку** з можливих.

5. На *самом деле* (действительно) / **Насправді** (дійсно)

Discourse meaning:

Actually, neither silicon nor germanium crystals have been satisfactory for this application.

На самом деле, ни кристаллы кремния, ни германия не были удовлетворительными для этих целей.

Насправді, ні кристали кремнію, ні германію були задовільними для цих цілей.

Non-discourse meaningЖ

– A blackbody does not **really** exist in nature.

Черного тела **на самом деле** в природе не существует.

Чорного тіла **насправді** в природі не існує.

The last example represents special semantic condition – superposition, where discourse or non-discourse meaning depends from the position in the sentence [8].

All units that have lost their original meaning and transferred to discourse particles, get a number of formal features (mainly syntax and intonation ones) that help to distinguish discourse meaning and usage from non-discourse. E. Khachaturyan identified the main features:

– discourse particle could not be an answer to a question when using in isolation;

– it do not use with negation (unless negation is a part of a discourse word);

– it usually is omitted with indirect speech;

– it can not be repeated in echo-question;

– unlike members of sentences, position of a discourse word (that has no syntactic function in the sentence) is not fixed, but is determined by a semantic criteria;

– usually, discourse particle or the entire construction with it in a statement is distinguished by lexical means (such pauses).

In this work we attempted to classify and describe Ukrainian discourse units and their English and Russian equivalents. The study was conducted on the dictionaries: "Russian-Ukrainian-English for Physicists" Yudina S., "Russian-English Translators Dictionary: A Guide to Scientific and Technical Usage" Zimmerman M., "Russian-English Chemical and Polytechnic Dictionary" Ignatiev Kallahen L.

The basis of our classification are the following five groups of discourse words, distinguished by Viktorova E.:

– organizational-structural (поскольку – оскільки – aslongas / because / since; однако – but / howewer);

– subjective-modal (фактически – фактично – actually / in fact / as a matter of fact; казаться – здаватися – appear as / seem to);

20

– emphasizing (следует отметить, что – слід відзначити, що – it should be observed that / it should bepointed out that);

– reflexives (следует отметить, что – слід відзначити, що – it should be observed that / it should bepointed out that);

– discourse words of direct addressing (а именно – а саме – namely / that is; с точки зрения – з точки зору – from a viewpoint of).

REFERENCES

1. *Викторова, Е. Ю.* Вспомогательные и коммуникативные единицы в политическом дискурсе : проблемы перевода (на материале русского и английского языков) / Е. Ю. Викторова // Изв. Сарат. ун-та. – Саратов, 2010. – Т. 10, № 4. – С. 40–47.

2. *Еремина, И. С.* Установление английских эквивалентов русского *как бы* : (экспериментально-сопоставительное исследование на материале английского и русского языков) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.20 / И. С. Еремина. – Пятигорск, 2005. – 133 с.

3. *Правикова, Л. В.* Дискурсивные маркеры: современное состояние проблемы / Л. В. Правикова // Вестник ПГЛУ, 2000. – № 4.

4. *Киселева & Пайар.* Дискурсивные слова русского языка / Киселева; под ред. Пайар // Опыт контекстно-семантического описания. – М. : Метатекст, 1998.

5. *Каменский, М. В.* Социолингвистическая парадигма дискурсных маркеров (на материале английского языка) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / М. В. Каменский. – Ставрополь, 2007. – 179 с.

6. *Ханну, Т.* Правда прямо идет, а с нею не разминешься (о статусе дискурсивных слов и частиц) / T. Hannu.

7. *Хачатурян, Е. В.* Семантика и синтактика дискурсивных слов глагольного происхождения в современном итальянском языке : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.05 / Е. В. Хачатурян. – М., 2000.– 171 л.

8. *Широков, В. А.* Комп'ютерна лексикографія : моногр. / В. А. Широков // НАН України. Укр. мов.-інформ. фонд. – Київ: Наук. думка, 2011. – 351 с.