ГЕРМАНСЬКІ МОВИ

Asgarova B. A.
Azerbaijan University

THE ROLE OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN INFORMATION STRUCTURE

This paper investigates the relationship between discourse coherence marking and information structure by examining two developing discourse connectives: it suggests that the grammaticalization of a lexeme in its construction into a discourse marker may involve acquiring discourse – level information structuring functions – indicating relative informational salience – and that grammaticalization of markers may be at least partly directed by information structure. The relation between discourse markers and information structure is mutual and complements each other. These linguistic devices perform not only temporal and spatial functions but also play major role in the construction of thematic continuity in discourse. In particular, attention has focused on the extent to which differing positions of markers correlate with different functions. But there has been emphasis on the discourse information-structuring functions of markers. Discourse markers are considered an effective instrument in distributing information in text and discourse. Discourse markers signal the information structure of discourse by emphasizing directions and relations within discourse. The present study, therefore focuses on the use of discourse markers in information structure of the text. The most important characters of discourse markers is that, they are an effective instrument to distribute information in text and discourse. Discourse Markers have been the main topic of research for 30 years under many different names. This paper presents an account of one view of discourse markers s with the aim of providing researchers in the field with a coherent definition of discourse markers and a presentation of the syntactic and semantic properties of this functional category that will enable them to compare their work on discourse markers with other researchers. It is necessary to stress that some grammatical elements are used for different functions which cannot easily be separated. Therefore we have to mention that some confusion can be made during the analysis of these textual functions of those grammatical elements. For example, sometimes the indefinite article is used not for the purpose of signaling new information, but for the classifying the object, thing or notion it refers. The distribution of information is signalled by discourse markers. The cohesion pattern of the texts is based on the specific to general reference. This kind of uses of grammatical devices rely on the social and communicative situations.

Key words: discourse, theme, rheme, pragmatic markers, particle, coherence.

Formulation of the problem. This paper deals with discourse, its relation with discourse markers and information structure. The first chapter investigates discourse and its various definitions given by linguistics and the characteristics of discourse markers as linguistic devices. The usages of discourse markers are also investigated. There is an argument on whether they are a syntactic or a pragmatic category. Some linguistics believe that discourse markers are one type of commentary pragmatic marker. The others accept this linguistic devices as sintactic markers. Second chapter covers the major components of information structure based on theme and rheme and the importance of discourse markers in informa-tion structure of the text. The roles of Verb-particle constructions are also highlighted in the paper.

Serving as the signals for the receiver these linguistic devices have different communicative weights. Given human ability to keep certain amount of information in memory discourse markers eventually perform strong cognitive functions in order to ensure global connexity in discourse.

The main purpose of this article is to determine the roles and the positions of discourse markers within the information structure of the text.

Presentation of the main material. In particular, attention has focused on the extent to which differing positions of markers correlate with different

functions. But there has been emphasis on the discourse information-structuring functions of markers and how these evolve. The focus of this research is two -pronged. The first part is to analize the terms discourse, discourse markers and differenciate the properties of discourse markers. The second part is to identify relationships between discourse markers and theme -rheme and analize these linguistic devices in thematic structure.

Discourse and properties of discourse markers

Discourse has been the main phenomenon of many linguistics.

The definition of discourse given by Chafe is more relevant [3, p. 39]:

I distinguish between discourse and text: discourse implies patterns and commonalities of knowledge and structures, where as a text is a specific and unique realization of a discourse. A Kibrik writes [13, p. 30].

Discourse is the notion larger than text. Discourse is both the process of language activity and ts result, but the result is also a text.

W. Chafe [3, p. 126] considers the discourse structure as the intonation unit that is as the mode of discourse relevant to a focus in consciousness. Each intonation unit usually has one element of new information and opposition of new and old information is interlinked with prosodic (stress and unstressed) and lexical actualization of certain references.

The way information is structured during the process of communication is very important. When we deliver message to a receiver, whether orally or in writing, we impose a structure in our speech and try to organize what we send in a way that will make it easier for a receiver to understand. Givon focuses attention on the fact that a sender uses different devices from grammar to ground information in discourse. He believes that new information appears to background (old or given) and their correlation defines the dynamics of text structure [6, p. 24]. Discourse markers are core elements in discourse and play an important role in information structure of the text. Firstly, we pay attention to the origin and theory of discourse marker.

We are dealing with a context of language learning that has been the focus informatιon structure. Theoretically, discourse markers are a functional class of verbal and non-verbal devices which provide contextual coordination for ongoing talk [16, p. 124]. The term discourse marker is used in a wide range of senses and a large number of different phenomena, extending from monosyllabic interjection-like particles to clausal expressions: the status of discourse markers remains uncertain.

According to the classic definition by Schiffrin [16, p. 31], discourse markers are "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk," and for Lewis" [14, p. 420], "discourse marker" is a label for an expression that combines the semantics of discourse-relational predications with syntactic dependency on a clausal host and low informational salience.

There is an argument on whether they are a syntactic or a pragmatic category, on which types of expressions the category includes, on the relationship of discourse markers to other posited categories such as connectives, interjections, modal particles, speaker-oriented sentence adverbials, and on the term "discourse marker" as opposed to alternatives such as "discourse connective" or "pragmatic marker" or "pragmatic particle" [14, p. 419–420]. Discourse markers are also called discourse particles, pragmatic markers, discourse connectives, adverbials, connecting adverbials, conjunctions [5, p. 216].

Fraser [3, p. 56] believes that discourse markers are one type of commentary pragmatic marker. Fraser divides discourse markers into discourse topic markers, discourse activity markers, and message relationship markers. Discourse markers are "metalingual comments" in which the speaker specifically comments on how what he is saying is to be taken. Fraser found that the presence or absence of lower level discourse markers, "words that speakers use to mark relationships between chunks of discourse such as so, well, OK, and now" aids comprehension. It is obvious that the thematized metalingual comments are not integrated with the representation of content which the recipients are constructing.

One of the main properties of defining Discourse Markers (DM) are that, they are syntactically independent from their environment.They are typically set off prosodically from the rest of the utterance. The other major property is Their meaning's being non-restrictive. Their meaning is procedural rather than conceptual-propositional. They are non-compositional and as a rule short. The main function of discourse markers is to relate an utterance to the situation of discourse, more specifically to speaker-hearer interaction, speaker attitudes, and/or the organization of texts Schiffrin [16, p. 64] puts it with reference to pragmatic markers, they "situate their host unit with respect to the surrounding discourse and with respect to the speaker-hearer relationship" DMs are multifunctional [16, p. 123]. While they tend to exhibit in fact a larger range of discourse functions, multifunctionality is also a feature to be observed in a number of other kinds of both lexical and grammatical

expressions and, to our knowledge, there do not exist any quantitative data to establish that DMs are really special in this respect. DMs signal a sequential relationship between the current utterance and the prior discourse, or a relationship across rather than within an utterance [3, p. 383].

Information structure and discourse markers in information structure. It should also be taken into consideration that M.A.K. Halliday identifies the textual component of the grammar of English as consisting of the features associated with two groups of resources: the structural and the cohesive. The first one is subdivided into the two areas – information structure and theme-rheme structure. The second is subdivided into four areas – reference, ellipsis and substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion [8, p. 123].

The main components of information structure are theme and rheme. Theme and Rheme are two terms which represent the way in which information is distributed in a sentence. The definition of Theme given by Halliday [7, p. 38] is that Theme is given information serving as "the point of departure" of a message. The given information is the information which has already been mentioned somewhere in the text, or it is shared or mutual knowledge from the immediate context. Theme typically contains familiar, old or given information. Theme provides the settings for the remainder of the sentence – Rheme. Rheme is the remainder of the message in a clause in which Theme is developed, it means that ,Rheme typically contains unfamiliar or new information. New information is knowledge that a writer assumes the reader does not know, but needs to have in order to follow the progression of the argument. The boundary between Theme and Rheme is simple: Theme is the first element occurring in a clause; the remainder clause is Rheme.

Theme may be realized by a nominal group, verbal group, adverbial group, prepositional phrase or a dependent clause.The rheme is defined as the part of a sentence which adds most to the advancing process of communication and it has the highest degree of communicative dynamism. It expresses the largest amount of extra meaning.But the theme carries the lowest degree of communicative dynamism. The thematic elements are communicatively less dynamic and they carry a smaller amount of communicative dynamism than the rhematic elements. The rheme in English is often signaled by the indefinite article, particles, time adverbs, determiners, the words like *one* or *some*. The theme is signaled by the definite article, personal and demonstrative pronouns a determiner. The main signal of rheme in English is word order. As word order is relatively fixed, in English, it can stylistically distinguish rheme imposing pragmatic communicative dynamism. In fact, every language has various grammatical devices for certain communicative strategies. The theme and the rheme can be marked in a sentence by particles, definite and indefinite articles, personal and demonstrative pronouns, time adverbs and word order. Some linguists believe that the time adverbs like *now* also deliver new information in sentence [15, p. 119]. The particles, the articles, the adverbs and and other grammatical elements may be considered as deviation, but also fulfill the task of the text connexity markers. Theme-rheme or subject-verb-complement structure is only basis for possible communicative changes. It is also case for the English sentence, where the last word of the sentence is the rheme's natural position and therefore the communicative dynamism lies on the last word. W. Chafe wrote: emphasizing the communicative role of the predicate in sentences like: *Box is empty. Box* is regarded as the theme and *is empty* is rheme here [3, p. 275].

Th. Bloor and M. Bloor mention that there are in fact two structures and they should be clearly [1, p. 65]: *In* Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFG) *we recognize two parallel and interrelated systems of analysis that concern the structure of the clause with regard to organizing the message. The first of these is called information structure and involves constituents that are labeled Given and New. The second is called thematic structure and involves constituents that are labeled Theme and Rheme.*

Th. Bloor and M. Bloor also put difference between spoken and written language [1, p. 79–80].

In spoken English, we can use special emphasis and intonation to indicate that we are presenting New information in Theme position instead of the more normal Rheme position. We can make a contrast, for example, between The kettle`s boiling, which has New at the end, and The kettle`s boiling (not the milk) which has New in initial position.

In written English prose, however, it is more difficult to vary the relationship of Theme and Rheme to Given and New respectively.

The vast majority of uses of the unit I mean in Present-day English concern that of a thetical, also described as a "filler", a "hesitation marker", a "fumble", a discourse marker, a lexicalized clause [16, p. 319], or as a comment clause (Brinton 2008: 111). Edmondson (1981: 154–155) says that I mean belongs to "the let-me-explain" type fumbles: "In contrast to you know, I mean denotes less expected or predictable repairs" [2, p. 113].

There is also another effective instrument to distribute information in text and discourse called word order. Theme-rheme or old-new information structure based on the subject-verb-object order is considered as normal for the English sentence. Although theme-rheme structure is relevant for the sentence, it is not the case for text. As one of the most important properties of text is the intention, the sender makes utmost efforts to reflect it in the information structure. For this purpose the easiest way is to change normal word order in sentence. Such word order change called inversion has a strong pragmatic effect and helps the receiver to identify focus in the whole text.

As a discourse marker particles are essential elements of information structure.Length and complexity are formal or syntactic features, but not of particles placement is also affected by semantic considerations. Several studies showed that particles that express the direction or purpose of an action are more important than the completion of an activity or that they are subject to indirect completeness rather than particles that have an abstract meaning [4, p. 89].

The student ate up his lunch.

He turned off the radio.

In addition to syntactic and semantic factors, pragmatic factors affect the placement of particles in the information structure of the text. A number of studies have shown that the position of a particle changes with the information status of indirect completeness. If completeness represents information that can be given or identified, the particle tends to follow it.

What did she do with the ball? She picked the ball up.

Some researchers believe that the placement of particles in the information structure of the text is determined primarily by syntactic features [9, p. 76], others emphasize the importance of semantic features [4, p. 45] while others explain the placement of particles primarily in terms of pragmatic features.

Most studies consider the complexity of indirect completeness to be a syntactic factor [9, p. 71], but the syntactic complexity of a noun is closely related to its meaning. For example, a sentence consisting of a noun and a relative sentence is both syntactically and semantically complex: it is due to the fact that it contains syntactic complexity, and the semantic complexity is due to the fact that the included sentence contains a separate sentence [12, p. 78]. Thus, the complexity of indirect completeness refers to both syntactic and semantic features. In the same way, Jackendoff [12, p. 68] "recognizes a large number of constructions with different argu-ment structures and semantic structures, all of which share the syntax of the verb + particle. Some combinations of verbs + particles are productive, some are semiproductive, some are purely meaningless; "Verb-particle combinations have special semantic and syntactic properties. For example, he observes that a number of particles express the aspectic features of an event, verb-particle.

The adoption of markers in speech communication can ease the hearer's search for optimal relevance of utterances and add discourse coherence. From the viewpoint of the speaker, they could be used to help the speaker to find out information, prompt communicative situation. Analyzed from the hearer, the textual function of DMs in speech is to constrain the hearer's interpretation of utterances in order to cost the least processing effort for the hearer to achieve optimal relevance, which entitles the hearer to go ahead and recover the proposition which yields adequate contextual effects in the most accessible context. Discourse markers also help the hearer investigate for optimal relevance and make the discourse a coherent whole.

Conclusions. It is argued that the rise of discourse markers involves an operation whereby information units such as clauses, phrases, or words are transferred from the domain of sentence grammar to that of discourse organization. There is a close and mutual relationship between discourse markers and information structures and they complete each other. Discourse markers are considered to be the principal components in theme and rheme dichotamy. Discourse markers may also carry larger patterns. These patterns give the text cohesion and coherence, but may also put the audience in the role of the reader of narrative, rather than the reader of news.Discourse analysis can not be carried out ignoring the mental patterns because they are real basics for choosing core communicative information for such strategic purposes as the formation of common and particular semantic structures.

Discourse-level information structuring involves not only thematic progression (old/new) but also relative informational salience: how information is marked as foregrounded or backgrounded with respect to some other information. Initial position, including the left periphery, has been shown in the past to be associated with particular roles in discourse information structure: it is used for markers of new discourse frames, including topic change, and can also have an attention-seeking and presentational function, serving to place what follows in end-focus position, thereby foregrounding it.

References:
1. Bloor Thomas and Bloor Meriel: Studies in text and n discourse, London, 2004.
2. Brinton Laurel J. The Comment Clause in English. Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Developments. Cambridge, 2008.
3. Chafe, W. L. Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing. University of Chicago, 1994.
4. Fraser Morris: An approach to discourse markers, Journal of pragmatics 14 (3), 383–398, Boston university, Boston, 1990.
5. Gillian Brown, Yule, George: Discourse Analysis, Cambridge, Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge, 1989.
6. Givon T. Syntax: a functional-typological introduction, volume II. Amsterdam, 2004.
7. Halliday M. K. Introduction to functional grammar, London, 1985.
8. Halliday M. A. K and Hasan R. Cohesion in English, Longman, Paperback on Amazon. 1976.
9. Hawkins John A. A performance theory of order and constituency. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
10. Hyland K. Academic attribution Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. Applied Linguistics, Oxford University Press, 1999**.**
11. Hopper Paul J. Closs Elizabeth Traugott: Grammaticalization ,Front Cover. Cambridge University Press, Jul 31, 2003.
12. Jackendoff R. Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution, Oxford : Oxford University, 2002.
13. Kibrik Andrej: Referential strategies as developed for Russian narrative discourse, Oxford : Oxford University, 1997.
14. Lewis Richard, Adverbials in use, from predicative to discourse functions, Barcelona, 2011.
15. Quirk Randolph: A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language, New York : Longman, 1985.
16. Schiffrin Deborah: Discourse Markers. Front Cover. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Асгарова Б. А. РОЛЬ ДИСКУРСИВНИХ МАРКЕРІВ В ІНФОРМАЦІЙНІЙ СТРУКТУРІ

У цій статті досліджується взаємозв'язок між маркуванням когерентності дискурсу та інформаційною структурою шляхом вивчення двох дискурсивних зв'язок: передбачається, що граматикалізація лексеми при її побудові в маркер дискурсу може включати набуття функцій структурування інформації на рівні дискурсу – вказівка на відносну інформаційну значимість – і що граматикалізація маркерів може бути, принаймні, частково спрямована інформаційною структурою. Зв'язок між дискурсивними маркерами та інформаційною структурою є взаємною і доповнює один одного. Ці лінгвістичні засоби виконують не тільки тимчасові і просторові функції, але також відіграють важливу роль у побудові тематичної наступності в дискурсі. Зокрема, увага була зосереджена на тому, якою мірою різні положення маркерів корелюють з різними функціями. Але особливу увагу було приділено функціям маркерів, що структурують дискурсивну інформацію. Дискурсивні маркери вважаються ефективним інструментом поширення інформації в тексті і дискурсі. Маркери дискурсу сигналізують про інформаційну структуру дискурсу, підкреслюючи напрямки і відносини всередині дискурсу. Тому в цьому дослідженні основна увага приділяється використанню дискурсивних маркерів в інформаційній структурі тексту. Найбільш важливими характеристиками дискурсивних маркерів є те, що вони є ефективним інструментом поширення інформації в тексті і дискурсі. Дискурсивні маркери були основною темою досліджень протягом 30 років під різними назвами. У цій статті подано звіт про один погляд на маркери дискурсу з метою надання дослідникам у цій галузі послідовного визначення маркерів дискурсу і представлення синтаксичних і семантичних властивостей цієї функціональної категорії, які дозволять їм порівняти свою роботу над дискурсивними маркерами з іншими дослідниками. Необхідно підкреслити, що деякі граматичні елементи використовуються для різних функцій, які нелегко розділити. Тому ми повинні зазначити, що при аналізі цих текстових функцій цих граматичних елементів може виникнути деяка плутанина. Наприклад, іноді невизначений артикль використовується не для передачі нової інформації, а для класифікації об'єкта, речі або поняття, до яких він відноситься. Про поширення інформації сигналізують дискурсивні маркери. Схема зв'язності текстів заснована на конкретних і загальних посиланнях. Такого роду використання граматичних прийомів залежить від соціальних і комунікативних ситуацій.

Ключові слова: *дискурс, тема, рема, прагматичні маркери, частка, когерентність.*