

The Main Approaches to the Description of Discursive Markers

Safojeva Sadokat Nasillojeva¹

¹ Senior teacher of English language and literature department of Bukhara pedagogical institute

Abstract:

The problem of studying discursive markers as "formal explicators" of connections in the structure of discourse is attracting increasing attention from the linguistic community.

Keywords: discursive markers, speaker's attitude, composition of discursive vocabulary, fragments, discourse.

The term "discursive markers" is applied to a grammatically heterogeneous class of linguistic units united by common functional features. The main task of these units is to ensure the connection between the elements of discourse and the expression of the speaker's attitude to the state of affairs or to the statement of the interlocutor. The elements included in this class are heterogeneous: These can be conjunctions, adverbs, modal particles, lexemes, phrases, and clauses.

The unification of this group of heterogeneous linguistic units into one class causes some researchers to object. So, D. Blakemore believes it would be more appropriate to talk about the discursive or non-discursive use of linguistic units. Moreover, the analysis of the discursive vocabulary of the English language suggests that the degree of "discursivity" of an element is a graduated phenomenon. Some elements have a greater tendency to discursive use than others.

The volume and partial composition of discursive vocabulary varies from language to language, however, I would like to disagree with the statement of some researchers that discursive vocabulary is linguistically specific and difficult to translate into another language. This statement, in our opinion, is true only for a part of the discursive vocabulary, namely, for "desemanticized" units such as particles. Difficulties also arise when translating stable phraseological phrases, the literal translation of which from language to language can be difficult, but this category does not belong to the core of the class of discursive markers.

When discussing theoretical approaches, we will use examples from English, Russian and German as illustrative material, assuming that the principles of functioning of discursive markers for these languages are basically the same. The language-specific situations will be discussed separately.

It is believed that discursive markers represent an open class. In any case, attempts to create a closed list have not been successful at the moment.

In our work, we decided to use the term "discursive marker" as the most neutral and allowing us to reflect the essence of the phenomenon under study.

Initially, the interest in discursive markers arose within the framework of the study of discourse. We owe the discovery of the phenomenon of discourse to the research of U. Labov and the general "pragmatic turn" in linguistic science in the 70s.

Oral speech turned out to be the focus of the researcher's attention, and it was necessary to develop a theoretical apparatus for describing it. One of the first mentions of discursive markers as linguistic units can be found in the work of Labov and Fanshahl. The researchers drew attention to the special functioning of the English word *well* in phrases where *well* appeared in the initial position in the utterance. This tradition was further developed in the works of Levenson, Zwicky and many others. Intensive study of this problem began in the 1980s and continues in Western linguistics to this day. It is represented by a wide variety of approaches: cognitive, functional, pragmatic, semantic. The research is conducted on the material of different languages, on the material of the corpus of written texts and oral speech.

Long before the appearance of the term "discursive marker", those units that we now refer to this category were studied in their other hypostasis. We are talking about the work of V.V. Vinogradov, who distinguished a separate class of modal words and modal particles. Independently of V.V. Vinogradov, Antoine Cullioli in the late 60s developed the problem of the semantics of "official" words and polysemous lexical units within the framework of the "linguistics of utterance" created by h. It was Antoine Cullioli who introduced the concept of a "discursive word" into scientific use. This term is also used in two collective monographs, which appeared as a result of the work of a joint Russian-French project headed by K.L. Kiseleva and D. Payar.

The question of the relationship between oral and written discourse is quite relevant in the case of discursive markers. Discursive markers, as a rule, are considered to belong to the world of oral discourse, written discourse is considered secondary to oral. The question of the relationship between oral and written discourse has been debated for a long time. Traditionally, grammar analyzed the data of the written language, oral speech was considered less worthy of study as a "corrupted version" of the language. The understanding that written language is not completely identical to spoken language came in the 70s of the twentieth century, when linguistics turned to the study of real speech. Nevertheless, this did not lead to the abandonment of research based on the written corpus of texts. For example, the illustrative base of Grammar-80 is based on the material of fiction . What is the difference between a written mode and an oral one? Both oral and written discourse are manifestations of language. Let's list their main differences. Firstly, the material feed rate is fundamentally different. Spontaneous speech is generated at a rate an order of magnitude higher than the speed of writing or reading. As a result, spontaneous speech is less thoughtful both in terms of organization and in the choice of individual word forms .

Secondly, oral speech has a number of specific properties:

- 1) there is a great tendency to creative word formation (including as a result of reservations),
- 2) a fairly high degree of self-repetition of certain constructions, "clinging",
- 3) in colloquial speech, the traditional, from a grammatical point of view, word order is more often violated.

The next, very important difference, which Kibrik points out after Cheif, is that a sentence, traditionally an object of research for linguistics, cannot be used as a basic unit for analyzing oral discourse. Oral text is generated by "quanta". In an oral text, fragmentation differs from fragmentation of a written text. In an oral text, the minimum prosodic unit is a clause, while in written discourse there is a phenomenon of integrating clauses into complex sentences. And finally, oral discourse has such an important tool as non-verbal means: facial expressions, gestures.

Nevertheless, despite all the differences, the study of discursive markers on the material of written discourse seems quite promising. Discursive markers are no less characteristic of written discourse than of oral discourse. Moreover, this does not mean only fiction, where the use of certain discursive markers can be an artistic device. For scientific discourse, the use of discursive markers is also an important part of the representation of the text. It is known that in Europe the use of discursive markers became widespread only during the Enlightenment. I. Schildt's research shows that the frequency of using discursive markers in German prose increases sharply only at the beginning of the XVIII century. V.V. Vinogradov also writes that in the Russian language the class of modal words increases markedly in the XVIII-XX centuries. However, even before the 18th century, discursive markers, or certain elements close to them in function, were used in traditional texts.

Let's consider the main approaches to the description of discursive markers and define the criteria for recognizing a word as a discursive marker. As already mentioned, there are narrow and broad approaches to the composition of discursive markers. In this paper, we will consider only fragments of written discourse. Moreover, we consider discursive markers in the narrow sense of this term, i.e. we will be interested in lexemes for which use as a discursive marker is regular and specific. Theoretically, any word can be used outside of its "main" reference meaning, the "portability" of the meaning is one of the signals of discursive use, however, this does not automatically make this word a discursive marker. A discursive word must satisfy the following conditions.

- 1) The discursive marker ensures the coherence of the text at a level greater than the clause.
- 2) The discursive marker indicates the speaker's attitude. This attitude can be expressed in two aspects: 1) attitude to the state of things (to the proposition);
- 3) attitude to the previous statement.

These two positions are recognized by proponents of a wide variety of concepts. However, the first criterion is generally recognized by all authors (even those who neglect this criterion in the process of analyzing specific cases), and the second criterion is optional (optional). Some researchers take the second criterion (we can call it "commenting") beyond the limits of discursive labeling, which, in our opinion, is wrong.

Discursive markers became the object of research within the framework of the following approaches: contextual-semantic, pragmatic, discursive and cognitive. It is not possible to clearly distinguish between these approaches, since research is usually at the intersection of disciplines. Research on discursive markers has been conducted on the material of various languages, including exotic languages, but English certainly occupies the leading place in terms of the number of publications. Here we will look at several classifications proposed in the works that have become classic today. The corresponding classifications have been created in relation to English, Russian and German. We will be interested in the following points:

- 1) what types of vocabulary fall into the class of discursive markers;
- 2) principles of classification of discursive markers.

Let's start with the classifications proposed by D. Shifrin, B. Fraser and D. Blakemore, whose work in the field of the study of discursive markers is currently considered fundamental in Western

studies. All three researchers used English as their material and proposed three different classifications.

D. Shifrin considered discursive markers from the point of view of their functioning in discourse. The main function of discursive markers, according to the researcher, is their ability to ensure the coherence of the text at different levels of speech. Cohesion is understood here as the ability to establish a connection between adjacent units of discourse. The classification is based on the type of logical relationship of connected clauses. Each marker communicates at a certain level of discourse, but there are five such levels in total: 1) propositional structure; 2) structure of actions (type of speech act); 3) the structure of alternation; 4) the structure of participants; 5) the information state. According to Shifrin, each marker is "tied" to one or another level of speech, although it can function simultaneously on several levels. The concept of Shifrin has been repeatedly criticized regarding exactly how markers are distributed across speech levels [Redeker 1990: 368]. Thus, G. Riedeker, generally accepting the concept of D. Shifrin, believes that discursive markers are only explicators of implicit coherent connections, and do not implement these connections themselves. Despite the differences, researchers in this field recognize that discursive markers, with the exception of a few units (such as well, oh), have a "basic" meaning, which contributes to the process of representation of an utterance, limiting the number of possible interpretations. Shifrin included not only discursive markers with lexical expression, but also non-verbal means such as word order, the use of special constructions, intonation, etc. in the composition of discursive markers. Total D. Shifrin examined 11 discursive markers: and, because, but, I mean, now, oh, or, so, then, well, you know. However, the researcher believes that their distribution is archetypal. Following Zwicky. D. Shifrin considers the following parameters essential for attributing a linguistic unit to discursive markers:

- 1) syntactic separation from the sentence;
- 2) use in the initial position;
- 3) the presence of an independent prosodic contour;
- 4) the ability to function at both the local and global levels of discourse;
- 5) the ability to function at different levels of discourse.

Shifrin notes that some of the discursive particles establish relations between "facts" only at the level of semantics; other discursive markers establish relations between sentences at the logical (epistemic) level and/or at the pragmatic level of the speech act. For example, so functions on a pragmatic and semantic level.

The classification proposed by B. Fraser differs significantly from the classification of Shifrin, but their views on the function of discursive markers in the text coincide. Fraser considers discursive markers from a "grammatical-pragmatic" point of view. In his early works, Fraser calls discursive markers "pragmatic formatives", later he replaces this name with the term "pragmatic markers". According to Fraser, discursive markers should include only verbally expressed units "that do not contribute to the content of the proposition", but indicate different types of messages. Among the pragmatic markers, Fraser identifies four classes: basic markers, commentator markers, parallel markers, and discursive markers.

- 1) Basic markers indicate the type of speech act, mood; basic markers are expressed using "pragmatic idioms" (would you, would you), as well as verb moods;
- 2) Commenting markers make up a separate layer of the message, a kind of "discourse within discourse"; they "comment" on the basic message and include: comment markers (unfortunately); evidential markers (possibly, they say, I heard, that); "politeness formulas": If I am not mistaken, If you do not mind.

3) Parallel markers complement the basic messages. These include: vocatives, markers of displeasure, markers of solidarity: addresses by name, (my dear, frankly speaking), etc.

4) Discursive markers indicate how the underlying message is related to the context. As part of the discursive markers, topic change markers are distinguished: by the way; contrastive markers: but, however, although; detailing markers: in other words, more than that, partially, also, and, or; output markers so, accordingly.

Fraser's classification is probably based on the type of indication that contains a discursive marker: basic markers explicate the illocutionary type of utterance; commenting and parallel markers encode both illocutionary force and propositional ratios; discursive markers are only the ratio of propositions.

This classification, in general, looks logical and convincing. However, we cannot agree that commenting markers are removed from the composition of "discursive" markers.

It should also be noted that Fraser's idea that discursive markers are a subclass of a broader class of pragmatic markers finds correspondences in the works of Russian scientists. For example, E.V. Paducheva speaks about discursive categories, to which she refers, among other things, certain verb forms, egocentricity, etc.

The concept of D. Blackmore is based on the provisions of the theory of relevance proposed by D. Sperber and D. Wilson. The researcher devoted many articles to this topic and published the monograph "Relevance and Linguistic Meaning" in 2002.: the Semantic and Pragmatic Discourse Markers" . D. Blackmore does not believe that discursive units form a separate class of linguistic units (and here we agree with her), but for convenience of description, the term "discursive connectors" (discourse connective) is used in her work. The researcher believes that discursive markers do not have a "representational meaning" and do not participate in the representative representation of a sentence, but are "instructions" on what the conceptual representation of sentences should. D. Blackmore consistently carries out this idea in his works of 1987, 1992, 1995, 2002. Thus, Blackmore considers discursive markers as "indications" (instructions) expressed by lexical means regarding what restrictions should be imposed on the context for its correct interpretation. The Blackmore concept presupposes four groups of such constraints that are imposed on the context so that it is "relevant" :

- 1) so, therefore, too, also – indicate the presence of some position that should be taken out of context;
- 2) after all, moreover, furthermore – reinforce the conclusions of the current discourse;
- 3) however, still, nevertheless, but – indicate the juxtaposition of units;
- 4) anyway, accidentally, by the way, finally – determine the role of the current statement in relation to the discourse.

This classification is based on the type of relationship between the units of discourse indicated by the discursive marker.

So far, we have analyzed the works performed on the material of the English language. The above classifications are characterized by the fact that they do not pay close attention to the partial belonging of linguistic units acting as discursive markers.

REFERENCES:

1. Muxtorovna, K. N., Shavkatovna, S. N., & Nasilloevna, S. S. (2019). The role of the ethnographic vocabulary in the English and Uzbek languages. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(9 S3), 1551-1554.

2. Qayumova, N., & Safoyeva, S. (2020). The Connotative meanings of noun and adjective lexemes in Uzbek and English languages. *Scientific reports of Bukhara State University*, 6(82).
3. Safoyeva, S.(2024) PRAGMATIK MARKERLAR, LINGVISTIK YONDASHUV VA BOG‘LIQLIK NAZARIYASI. Innovative Development in Educational Activities. 3\3.
4. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2023). SPECIFIC ASPECT OF STUDYING RUSSIAN APHORISMS. *O'ZBEKISTONDA FANLARARO INNOVATSIYALAR VA ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI*, 2(18), 1236-1241.
5. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2021). The image of a woman in a Victorian novel.
6. Xamroyevna, X. G., Shavkatovna, S. N., Nasilloevna, S. S., & Khaydarovna, P. S. (2022). Homonyms In The Uzbek And English Languages. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 10633-10636.
7. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2022). Sociological method and its application in literature.
8. Safoyeva, S. (2022). Text-reality integration and sociological analysis of literary text. *Центр научных публикаций (buxdu. uz)*, 26(26).
9. Safoyeva, S. (2024). UNRAVELING THE TAPESTRY OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE/PRAGMATIC MARKERS ACROSS CULTURES. *Collection of scientific papers «ΛΟΓΟΣ»*, (March 1, 2024; Paris, France), 337-340.
10. Sadokat, S. (2024). Pragmatic Markers and Gender. *Miasto Przyszłości*, 45, 622-624.
11. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2023). SPECIFIC ASPECT OF STUDYING RUSSIAN APHORISMS. *O'ZBEKISTONDA FANLARARO INNOVATSIYALAR VA ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI*, 2(18), 1236-1241.
12. Safoyeva, S. (2022). SOCIOLINGUISTICS IS THE STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)*, 15(15).
13. Safoyeva, S. (2022). SOCIOLOGICAL METHOD AND ITS ANALYSIS. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)*, 15(15).
14. Safoyeva, S. (2020). THE CONNOTATIVE MEANINGS OF NOUN AND ADJECTIVE LEXEMES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)*, 1(1).