

*Mykhaylenko V. V.,
Doctor of Philology, professor
Dept. of Translation and Philology
Ivano-Frankivsky King Danylo Galatsky University of Law*

DISCOURSE PARTICLE FUNCTIONAL SEMANTICS

Summary. The present paper is focused on the origin and development of discourse particles in fiction. Originally they come from pre-verb adverbs which moved to the pre-sentence adverbs gradually shifting into sentential particles and later on into discourse particles of speaker's attitude or comment to the speech act. However, they retain their adverbial nature of a modifier. Evidentially, such formula of evolution has become possible due to the functional-discourse analysis.

Key words: adverb, modal operator, sentential particle, discourse particle, functional – discourse analysis.

Introduction. This paper sets out a number of reasons for establishing a distinction between sentential (modal) adverbs and discourse (modal) particles [2, p. 449–491]. Adverbs [see also adverbs in the languages of Europe [10, p. 187–286]: and particles are generally difficult to define as two distinct and independent word classes in terms of unitary criteria and distinctive properties. The traditional role of an adverb is that of modifying a verb (*certainly know; cannot honestly say; had waited patiently*) or a verb phrase (*eventually extended to include, seemed to be falling quickly now*). In reality, adverbs also modify adjectives (*perfectly elliptical; certainly not an unknown; almost inaudible*), other adverbs (*most certainly; quite possibly; almost definitely*), and sentences (*Reluctantly Langdon turned and tried to get his bearings; "Unfortunately", Langdon added, "the unification of science and religion was not what the church wanted"*). Traditional modal adverbs are used to show whether an assertion is *true, doubtful or not doubtful* [15, p. 215–239]. Modal adverbs are, in form, like adverbs of manner, but they modify the whole sentence. George Yule specifies them as a group of *comment verb* including "a comment or opinion about what is being said or written" which usually used in "front or end position with commas" [14, p. 118].

The maximal proposition of the sentence with the modal adverb is its propositional content and the role of this proposition in the discourse, so far as it is primarily coded with linguistic means, its (sentential) modality or sentence mode. That part of the sentential modality [see other types of modality: 8, p. 10–17], that is structurally determined can be called sentence mood. It follows that sentence mood is part of the structural meaning of a sentence.

A *particle* is a word that does not fit into the conventional grammatical categories. Though, we must add that particles also serve a sort of 'modification' function. Modal particles, for example, take the whole sentence as their object and fit its content to the context of speech. This 'vague' similarity, though, should not be interpreted as a motivation for assimilating the two categories, especially when other syntactic properties, such as the sentential position, the distribution, and the correlation with sentence types are taken into consideration. Criteria for determining what a particle is are not agreed upon yet. Generally, a loose definition is something like 'an invariant element with grammatical function and pragmatic meaning that does not belong to one of the major grammatical categories'. The

negative aspect of this definition allows for the inclusion not only of question particles and similar, but of interjections, prepositions, phrasal verb particles, etc. But their use is very important to express the speaker's / writer's attitude to the utterance.

Discussion. This study does not embrace the theory of any particular school nor does it adopt any particular grammatical theory. Given the complexity of the subject and the vast array of the analyses currently available, we draw on the research which we consider to be central. Many English particles are described as "interjections" or a catch-all term for words that have no clear part of speech. A *modal* particle is a word used in speech to convey extra emphasis or emotion, without any real grammatical function. Then from the traditional parts of speech analysis it is referred to as a sentential modal adverb or a sentential modal particle. It is frequently admitted that English has no modal particles, but consider the units like *then, there, now, ever*, etc. used in the sentence and neither part of a sentence is modified by them. Notice that all these words have their original usages apart from their use as particles. Another way to think of them is as 'verbal emotion modifiers. In any case, the exact definition of a modal particle is complicated. Some can have different emphatic meanings, so they appear under more than one heading below. Criteria for determining what a particle is are not agreed upon. Generally, there is a vague definition 'an invariant element with grammatical function that does not belong to one of the major grammatical categories'. The negative aspect of this definition allows for the inclusion not only of question particles and similar, but of interjections, prepositions, phrasal verb particles. There is another term to define a modal adverb – *adverb of certainty* which is a constituent of a more general class – modal adverbs. The categories of sentence mood and sentential modality are not very well-investigated topics either in current linguistic typology [14, p. 215–239]. We have one more term "attitudinal adverbs" expressing the speaker's / writer's attitude toward the state or event in the sentence. [6, p. 252–256]. They are typically placed before the subject of the sentence. One can come across common attitudinal adverbs *fortunately, unfortunately luckily, unluckily obviously*, etc. in any discourse register. The term 'particle' [1, p. 1–10] encompasses a wide range of elements with differing functions, and it is not at all clear how they can all be classed as one homogeneous category.

Investigation. Randolph Quirk et al classified in a separate category of 'content disjuncts' or 'attitudinal disjuncts' [9, p. 615] which are said to make observations on the actual content of the utterance and its truth conditions' [9, p. 615]. Disjuncts are one of the four types of adverbials, others are adjuncts, conjuncts, and sub-juncts. Semantically, disjuncts can be defined as adverbials whose role is to make a comment of some kind on the whole of the sentence or clause of which they are an element. They are more detached and 'superordinate' that their contentive scope extends over the sentence as a whole. In my opinion this outcome is based on

the sentence analysis level where there is a close correlation of the adverb lexical semantics (its lexical meaning to designate a variety of modalities *possibility, original probability, obligation, unreality, volition, predestination, command, uncertainty, hearsay knowledge* and functional semantics of the sentence: *declarative modality; interrogative modality; imperative modality; desiderative modality; and exclamative modality*. There are the following ways of verbalizing sentential modality: interrogative words, verbal mood, word order, intonation, modal sentence particles which also mark negation, complementation, attitudes and evidentiality [12; 11, p. 7–46; 15, p. 215–239]. Randolph Quirk et al differentiate disjuncts into the disjuncts indicating the degree of confidence the speaker has in the statement's truth and the disjuncts indicating the speaker's value judgment on the content of the sentence. In case the speaker is less confident s/he might substitute "possibly" for "probably".

We have retrieved units from Den Brown's discourse ("Angels and Demons") which in traditional grammar would be referred to as adverbs either of modal, intensive, emphatic meaning, or pre-verb adverbs and sentence / sentential adverbs with the aim of their further functional semantic analysis [5, p. 853–861] to determine their specific features leading to shift and transposition, for instance:

1. The adverb *possibly* according to the definitional analysis of its entry in the OED has four components: (1) in a possible manner; according to what may or can be (in the nature of things); by any existing power or means; within the range of possibility; by any possibility (1319, 1583, 1591, 1680, 1710). Usually, now always, as an intensive qualification of can or could; (2) irregularly used instead of possible in adverbial phrases, as if possibly, soon as possibly, by all means possibly (1560, 1583, 1640, 1654, 1566, 1676) [Obs.]; (3) as is possible to one; according to one's ability; as much or as well as one can (1657) [obs. Rare]; (4) Qualifying the statement, and expressing contingency or subjective possibility According to what may be (as far as one knows); perhaps, perchance, maybe (1600, 1685, 1697, 1711, 1847, 1877, 1899). Often as intensive qualification of may/might. The dominant component can be defined as *manner* which can reveal others like *modality (ability), qualification, intensification* in combinability with modals can/could, may/might [see: OED]. Evidentially, it is more functional semantics, than a purely lexical meaning.

In (1.1) the adverb *possible* demonstrates a regular pre-verb distribution – if it were a declarative sentence – and post-verb position, then it must be an adverbial modifier of modality, the term much depends on the scholar, for instance:

1.1. How could they possibly contain any clue? So you think the Vatican would have buried any evidence corroborating the Illuminati threat?

1.2. You think Vetra's work is why he was killed? Quite possibly. Leonardo told me he was working on something groundbreaking.

The given text fragment illustrates the dialogue where the meaning of *possibly* is intensified with the adverb *quite* the dominant meaning component of which is *completely, wholly, altogether, entirely, to the fullest extent or degree* [see: OED]. The phrase underwent a syntactical transposition from a part of the sentence (1.1.) into an autonomous sentence. If the sentence had retained the pre-verb position of the adverbial phrase:

1.2.1*. His work quite possibly killed him.

Here would have been a regular distribution matrix of the adverb in the sentence. But the introduced change would have impaired the author's intention 'to express the character's attitude ut-

tered' and at the same time to link the preceding utterances with the following context. Therefore, the adverbial phrase is shifted into a sentence with its own meaning of *attitude* or *comment* and a linking function of discourse. Our suggestion finds its proof in the following example:

1.3. Quite possibly. Any threat, real or imagined, weakens faith in the church's power.

Logically this adverbial phrase should have belonged to the functional semantic means expressing 'degree' If this phrase had been employed by the author within the sentence structure it would have been an adverbial phrase of degree, on the contrary, in illustration (1.2; 1.3) with the dominant component meaning (4) and the position of the phrase point its transposition into a discourse particle, besides the phrase fulfills function of linking in the discourse.

2. The adverb *certainly* has also the dominant component *manner* in its semantic structure: (1) in a manner that is certain; in a way that may be surely depended on; with certainty (1300, 1649, 1793, 1863, 1875, 1878). It reveals a number components in a specific distribution or context: (2) with certainty as to quality, amount, etc.; definitely, precisely, exactly (1460, 1588, 1626, 1714) [obs.]; (3) Without fail, unfailingly, infallibly (1300, 1440, 1607, 1711, 1813); (4) fixedly, so as not to be altered (1591, 1704); (5) with subjective certitude, with assurance, surely (1300, 1450, 1622, 1680, 1729) [see: OED]; (6): an assurance or admission of the truth of an assertion as a whole: without doubt; in truth and fact; of a certainty; assuredly, undoubtedly, unquestionably; an admission of an opponent's contention, to be followed by 'but', etc.; strong assent or affirmative reply (1300, 1350, 1450, 1596, 1644, 1712, 1729, 1752, 1781, 1801, 1875) [see: OED]. The functional semantic component (6) actualized in the following text fragment requires a wide context to be objectively interpreted, for instance:

2.1. You must have called the police. "I most certainly have not". "What?" Kohler's gray eyes sharpened. "The situation is complex, Mr. Langdon". Langdon felt a wave of apprehension. "But ... certainly someone else knows about this!"

Here is a sentential adverb in the initial position modifying the sentence and realizing periphery the component (6). The following transformations can point out that the adverb modifies every part of the sentence:

2.1*. Certainly someone else; 2.2*. Certainly ... knows; 5.3*. Certainly ... about this. Although, as an adverb clause it must modify the following clause as a whole [cf. the history of the adverb shift in the sentence structure: 12].

The adverb may be taken out of the sentence pattern and used as a separate sentence, for in both cases (2.1 [2] and 2.1*/2*/3* it is a sentence adverb or a sentential one expressing the speaker's *attitude* or *comment* and serving as a linking element [see the relationship of discourse and its constituents: 7, p. 725–732]. On the contrary, in the standard matrix distribution it is a regular pre-verb adverb (*certainly seem to be enjoying*), for instance:

2.2. You certainly seem to be enjoying those niches! "the docent said, looking delighted. Were you aware that the tapering thickness of the walls is the reason the dome appears weightless?"

3. The adverb *actually* has the dominant component: (1) *practically, actively, as a true deed* – in a way characterizing deeds (1587, 1651, 1660) [obs.]; (2) *actively, energetically* (1470, 1485) – [obs.]; (3) in act or fact; as opposed to *possibly, potentially, theoretically, ideally; really, in reality* 1587, 1608, 1775, 1782, 1841, 1868, 1878); (4) *as a present fact, at present, for the time being* (1663, 1699, 1832, 1857); (5) *as a matter of fact, in truth, truly; indeed;*

even. The following remark can be employed in favor of a further development of a new semantic function: (6) 'not said of the objective reality of the thing asserted, but as to the truthfulness of the assertion and its correspondence with the thing; hence added to vouch for statements which seem surprising, incredible, or exaggerated' (1762, 1837, 1849, 1863, 1878) [see: OED]. Six text fragments retrieved from the novel can illustrate 3 main types of the adverb *actually* semantic functions:

(a) a regular pre-verb adverb:

3.1. But nobody has ever actually found it?"

(b) a sentential adverb (*actually* + S):

3.2. Actually", Langdon said, "we don't have that kind of time".

He pointed overhead to a filtered duct.

3.3. The poem said Santi's earthly tomb. Does that mean anything to you?" Langdon hastened diagonally across the Courtyard of the Sentinel. – Earthly? Actually, there's probably no more earthly place in Rome than the Pantheon ... *really*.

(c) a separate adverb sentence (S1 [Actually] + S2). Meaning component (5) is actualized in (3.4–3.6):

3.4. Actually ... Langdon thought, considering it more closely. This may be the shrewdest cataloging I've ever seen.

3.5. Vittoria hesitated. "Actually..." She glanced over at him with a strange look. "It's not technically a translation. The line is written in English".

3.6. Did Raphael design any tombs that had one of these demon's holes? The docent scratched his head. Actually. I'm sorry... I can only think of one. Only one? Langdon could not have dreamed of a better response.

The illustrations (3.4–3.6) clearly stress the development of the discourse function – to link the preceding context with the following one and retain the meaning component (6).

It is quite evident that the speaker's attitude can be determined on the discourse analysis level, therefore, the units' contentive scope extends over the discourse as a whole. Consequently, we can observe a transposition of sentential (modal) adverbs into discourse (modal) particles or here is a case of grammaticalization of the lexeme into a discourse forming particle, for a further integral study of modal particles we must take into account their functional equivalents [see; 13, p. 1391–1417].

Here are examples of modal adverbs: (1) *probably, possibly, evidently, actually, really, factually, apparently, certainly, surely, essentially, fundamentally* [9, p. 621]. These disjuncts constituting a subgroups of units commenting on the degree of truth [8, p. 9], and expressing conviction or doubt when the speaker expresses his/her judgement – what is said true or false [3, p. 337–351].

4. The next example illustrates strengthening of the discourse particle: the original adverb *absolutely* has also a primary dominant meaning component: *position, manner, or degree* which can reveal several other components due to its distribution, for instance: (1) separately, independently; (2) in a manner detached from other things; without the existence or presence of anything else; separately, independently (1532, 1557, 1603, 1618, 1736, 1807, 1877); (3) essentially (1661) [obs.]; (4) with unrestricted or unlimited ownership or authority; despotically (1612, 1660, 1875); (5) without the addition of any qualification, logical or grammatical (1656, 1668, 1766, 1816); (6) viewed by itself, without reference to, or comparison with, others, opposed to comparatively or relatively (1635, 1651, 1874); (7) without doubt or condition; (8) certainly, positively (1489, 1612) [obs.]; (9) without condition or limitation; unconditionally, unreservedly (1644, 1724, 1876); (10) actually,

positively, as a simple fact qualifying the truth of the statement rather than the fact stated (1851, 1853, 1856, 1863); (11) of manner and degree: completely, perfectly; (12) in a way that clears off everything; conclusively, finally, completely, unreservedly (1597, 1656, 1667, 1758, 1817); (13) perfectly; in the most excellent manner [obs.] (1601, 1634); (14) to the fullest extent, in the highest or utmost degree; entirely, wholly, altogether, quite (1570, 1602, 1635, 1676, 1704, 1790, 1834, 1855, 1860, 1862); (15) emphasizing no, nothing (1726, 1849, 1865, 1876, 1878); (16) also elliptical; colloquial (orig. U.S.) used as an emphatic affirmative: yes, quite so (1892, 1917, 1922, 1937) [OES]. In the text fragment (6.1) a periphery component (12) is actualized by the adverb *absolutely*: its independent use before the sentence from which it shifted and the referred component prove its complete transposition into the discourse particle:

4.1. Absolutely. In fact, they never revealed the location of their hideaway to anyone outside the brotherhood. This secrecy protected them, but it also posed a problem when it came to recruiting new members.

As you see the original adverb actualizes a periphery meaning component and changes its status of a part of a sentence or a clause in the sentence structure and develops the status of an autonomous sentence functioning as a discourse particle.

Conclusions and perspectives. The disjuncts or modal adverbs are in the focus of our investigation which from the verb modifier being a part of a sentence shifted into the sentential adverb being a sentence clause in a sentence and then developed into an autonomous sentence retaining various components of the original modal adverb meaning and playing the function of the discourse particle. Speakers present their information as contributions to larger argumentative activities, such as contrasting support, evidencing, etc. and these rhetorical relations are indicated by means of modal particles.

Adverbs or adverbials based on their meaning, can be divided into different types: **adjuncts** specifying circumstances as, *place, time, manner, reason, means, condition*, etc. of events; **disjuncts** expressing, *the speaker's attitude to the content of the clause, or evaluation of the likelihood, possibility, probability, etc. of the truth of the message*; and **conjuncts** expressing the clause relation of the clause to the context, for instance to the previous clause in a text.

The typology of the discourse (modal) particles of the adverbial origin necessitates a large corpus of illustrations based on various discourses posing our next research objective.

References:

1. Abraham W. Introduction / W. Abraham // W. Abraham (ed.). Discourse Particles: Descriptive and Theoretical Investigations on the Logical, Syntactic, and Pragmatic Properties of Discourse Particles in German. – Amsterdam : Benjamins, 1991. – Pp. 1–10.
2. Bayer Josef. Obenauer Hans-Georg. Discourse Particles, Clause Particles, and Question Types / Josef Bayer, Hans-Georg Obenauer // The Linguistic Review. – 2011. – Volume 28. – Issue 4. – Pp. 449–491.
3. Bellert Irena. On Semantic and Distribution Properties of Sentential Adverbs / Irena Bellert // Linguistic Inquiry. – 1977. – Volume 8. – Pp. 337–351.
4. Diewald Gabriele. Discourse Particles and Modal Particles as Grammatical Elements / Gabriel Diewald // K. Fischer (ed.). Approaches to Discourse Particles. – Amsterdam : Elsevier, 2006. – Pp. 403–425.
5. Fischer Kerstin, Drescher Martina. Methods for the Description of Discourse Particles / Kerstin Fischer, Martina Drescher // Language Sciences. – 1996. – Vol. 18. – Issue 3–4. – Pp. 853–861.
6. Mykhaylenko Valery V. Discourse markers pragmatics /

Valery V. Mykhaylenko ; I.O. Голубовська (ред.) // *Studia Linguistica* : зб. наук. праць. – Вип. 2. – К. : Київський національний університет ім. Тараса Шевченка, 2009. – С. 252–256.

7. Mykhaylenko Valery V. Functional Semantics of Tags in Discourse / Valery V. Mykhaylenko // *Messages, Sages and Ages. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on British and American Studies*. – Suceava, Romania : Editura Universitatii Suceava, 2006. – Pp. 725–732.
8. Palmer F.R. *Mood and Modality* / F.R. Palmer. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986. – Pp.xii +243.
9. Quirk Randolph, Greenbaum Sidney Leech, Geoffrey; Svartvik, Jan. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language/ Randolph Quirk, Sydney Greenbaum, Geoffrey, Jan Svartvik*. – London : Longman, 1985. – 897 p.
10. Ramat Paolo, Ricca Davide. *Sentence Adverbs in the Languages of Europe* / Paolo Ramat, Davide Ricca // *Johan van der Auwera, Donall P.O. Baoill (eds.). Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. – Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. – Pp. 187–286.
11. Ševčíková Magda, Mirovský Jiří. *Sentence Modality Assignment in the Dependency Treebank* / Magda Sevcikova, Jiri Mirovsky // *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. – No. 7499. Text, Speech and Dialogue: 15th International Conference, TSD 2012. Proceedings. – Berlin, Heidelberg : Springer Verlag, 2012. – Pp. 56–63.
12. Trips Carola. *From OV to VO in Early Middle English* / Carola Trips. – Amsterdam. Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing, 2002. – 356 p.
13. WALTERIT Richard. *Modal Particles and Their Functional Equivalents: a Speech-act-theoretic Approach* / Richard Waltereit // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 2001. – Vol. 33. – Issue 9. – Pp. 1391–1417.
14. Yule George. *Oxford Practice Grammar Advanced* / George Yule. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010. – 280 p.
15. Zaefferer Dietmar. *On the Coding of Sentential Modality* / Dietmar Zaefferer // *Georg Bossong, Bernard Comrie (eds.). Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*. 8. – Berlin. New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1990. – Pp. 215–239.

Михайленко В. В. Функціональна семантика дискурсивної частки

Анотація. У фокусі статті – походження й розвиток дискурсивної частки та її диференційні риси в реченні й дискурсі. Вона походить від прислівників, які характеризують усе речення й поступово переходять у реченнєві, а згодом і в дискурсивні частки, що виражають ставлення/коментар мовця до мовленнєвого акту. Проте вони зберігають свою прислівникову природу – модифікатора. Зазначена еволюційна формула стала можливою завдяки функціонально-дискурсивному аналізу.

Ключові слова: прислівник, модальний оператор, реченнєва частка, дискурсивна частка, функціонально-дискурсивний аналіз.

Михайленко В. В. Функциональная семантика дискурсивной частицы

Аннотация. В статье исследуются происхождение и становление дискурсивной частицы и её дифференциальные черты в предложении и дискурсе. Своими корнями указанная частица восходит к наречию, которое характеризует целое предложение и постепенно переходит в предложение в структуре предложения и далее в дискурсивную частицу со значением отношения/комментария говорящего к речевому акту. Но они сохраняют свою природу наречия – модификатор. Предлагаемая формула эволюции частицы стала возможной благодаря функционально-дискурсивному анализу.

Ключевые слова: наречие, модальный оператор, частица предложения, дискурсивная частица, функционально-дискурсивный анализ.