

THE CORRELATION OF ADVERSATIVE AND CAUSAL DISCOURSE MARKERS

Irrespective of the main theories dealing with the study of discourse markers (DM) they abridge in the sense that they perceive similarly the main functions carried out by discourse markers – they act as contextual coordinates, index adjacent utterances to the speaker/ hearer or both, connect the utterance to prior or subsequent discourse /Schiffrin, 1995: 52/. Adversative and causal DMs are also endowed with the ability of linking the sentence elements both formally and mentally. In order to reveal the communicative nature of adversative discourse markers it is essential to examine the number of ways that conceptualize the interplay between viewpoints in language use and language structure. E. Roulete distinguishes between “monologues (one physical speaker) and dialogues (two-physical speaker), as well as between monological (one viewpoint) and dialogical (two viewpoints) discourses” /Roulette, 1984: 32/.

The main distinction between monological and dialogical viewpoints is closely tied to whether the viewpoints are constructed as argumentatively parallel, i.e. oriented towards the same conclusion, or as argumentatively opposing, i.e. oriented toward different conclusions: *Their separation did not exist in all its finality, **but** Jennie felt destructed* (Dreiser, 305). This example shows that a single speaker is simultaneously advancing two viewpoints, which are in some sense incompatible, since the first part of the utterance (S1) presupposes a positive coloring of the second part of the utterance (S2). This presupposition is due to the negative use of the verb *exist* (*did not exist*) after a word *separation* (having negative connotation), which leads to a positive coloring of S2. The communicative features of DMs are revealed with more difficulty from *monological (one-speaker) viewpoint*, since we need to have a semantically and pragmatically burdened segment in the first part of the sentence, which helps the readers to deal with a more pragmatically burdened second part of the sentence.

In a dialogue bearing monological viewpoint S2 is the continuation of the thought expressed by the speaker of S1. Therefore, we deal with a monological viewpoint in a dialogue.

A: Many a time has she said so; and yet I am no advocate of entire seclusion.

B: On the contrary, when people shut themselves up entirely from society, it is a very bad thing (Dreiser, 140).

In many cases one can witness a sentence presenting a dialogue which bears a dialogical viewpoint. The background for such a use is the unexpected thought expressed by the speaker of the second clause. This unexpected shift creates different lines of thoughts expressed by different speakers in a dialogue.

A: He would make her an ideal husband, his father would be pleased, everybody would Be delighted.

B: Instead, he had drifted and drifted, and then he had met Jennie, and somehow; after that, he did not want her any more (Dreiser, 310).

Here, we find it necessary to draw parallels between causal and adversative discourse markers in their functional and communicative behaviour. Causality is described as a major device for creating relevance in discourse. In order to understand the communicative and functional nature of causal discourse markers, it is essential to pay attention to the intertwinement between *content, epistemic (used in a level-abridging) sense and speech act level*. They together constitute the shift that one needs to pass from textual to the pragmatic fulfillment of causal DMs. Content and epistemic levels are more similar to the monological viewpoint expressed by adversative DMs. The content level is more similar to the monological viewpoint with semantic textual function, where the real world causality between events is expressed. However, the epistemic level is more similar to the monological viewpoint with both pragmatic and textual functions, where the speaker's reasoning comes forth. The speech act level is the complete functional 'twin' of dialogical viewpoint expressed by adversative DMs.

*Ladies know what to fend hands against, **because** they read novels that tell them of these tricks (Hardy, 148). [content or fact level]*

*John loved and appreciated her **because** he came back leaving the chain of all their grief behind (Hardy, 158). [epistemic level]*

*‘Does Jack Dollop work here? - **because** I want him! I have a big bone to pick with him, I can assure you’ (Hardy, 158). [speech act level]*

Having examined the communicative and causal DMs, we observed some overlap between them. The correlation between the mentioned types is seen while shifting from semantic domain to the pragmatic one. The main reason for our reference to the correlation of adversative and causal DMs was the research carried out by J. Spenader. While examining the peculiarities of these types, it becomes evident that they may overlap in their meanings, i.e. some of them may be used with both adversative and causal interpretations. Therefore, the research carried out by this scholar helped us to give a framed outline of our observations, since she took as the objective of her research the peculiarities of adversative and causal DMs, meanwhile including in her research the embedded relations of these DMs. Hereinafter we will present the set of DMs, that are exposed to an overlap: **though, even, despite, although, however, still, while, thus** /Spenader, 2007: 7/.

*These cogitations, **while** they were not at all reassuring, at least to pass the night away and the next morning Bass stopped on his way to work to say that Jane wished her to come home that same day (Dreiser, 125).*

It is clearly seen in this example that we deal with an overlap of embedded concessive relation in the causal marker *while*, which makes it closer to the adversative DMs with shades of meaning of concession (*despite, though, although*).

*The probabilities were that he would be very fair and liberal. At the same time Robert was constantly beating her. **Still**, there was no certainty that the old gentlemen might do anything or nothing (Dreiser, 146).*

The interpretation of this example seems rather incomprehensible at first sight, and only the temporal meaning of the adversative marker *still* helps to unfold its extra semantic realizations in a given discourse. Not to mention the role of context that becomes crucial for the adequate interpretation of the overlap of the marker *still* with causal meaning. The sentences coming before the one where the marker *still* is used, help the reader to get to know the background knowledge. The acquisition of this knowledge becomes crucial for the comprehension of the temporal duration of the given circumstances. After the cognition of this is at hand,

we see the causal realization of the adversative marker *still*.

*Lester was getting along to the time of life when his delighted ideas of all womanhood were fixed and not subject to change. **Thus far**, on his own plane and within the circle of his own associates, he had met no one who had appealed to him as did Jennie (Dreiser, 189).*

This example shows that the causal marker *thus* is used with an embedded adversative meaning. The beginning of the context helps the reader to get acquainted with the hero's 'delighted ideas of **all** womanhood', where the word *all* helps us to conclude at the result and therefore at the consequence of not excluding even a woman from this range. It means that the first part of the context is to serve as the *cause* for non-exclusion of even one woman from their whole range. The non-exclusion, thus, would serve as the *result* to our *cause*. However, the coming part of the context, reveals the contextual possibilities to an attentive reader. The writer narrows the range of 'womanhood' up to the 'circle of his associates' and we observe the adversative overtone of the causal marker *thus*.

The overlap of meanings of adversative and causal discourse markers turns out to be greatly dependent on the context. The dependence on the context helps the adversative and causal markers to be realized in low speech-act and hinders their use in higher levels of communicative realizations. Due to these facts we observe that the communicative function of adversative and causal DMs is more likely to occur when they are not too dependent on a given context. The presence of a 'wide' context hinders the total fulfillment of the communicative function. These findings were useful for drawing the final framework of the communicative and functional study of adversative and causal DMs.

REFERENCES

1. Ariel M. Pragmatic operators. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1998.
2. Couper-Kuhlen E., Kortman B. Cause, condition, contrast, concession // Cognitive and discourse perspective. Paris: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000.
3. Fraser B. An approach to discourse markers. New York: Dobson Publishing House, 1999.

4. Roulette E. Speech acts, discourse structure and pragmatic connectives // Journal of Pragmatics, 8, 1984.
5. Schiffrin D. Discourse markers, language meaning and context. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
6. Spenader J. Reliable discourse markers for contrast relations. Boston: Groningen University Press, 2007.
7. Dreiser Th. Jennie Gerhardt. London: Random House Group, 1911.
8. Hardy Th. Tess of the d'Urbervilles. New York: Random House Inc., 2005.

Լ. ՄԱՐԴՈՅԱՆ – *Դիսկուրսի ներհակական և պատճառական ցուցիչների հարաբերակցությունը.* – Հոդվածում քննվում է դիսկուրսի ներհակական և պատճառական ցուցիչների հարաբերակցության խնդիրը: Վերը նշված ցուցիչների գործառական-հաղորդակցական բնույթն ուսումնասիրվել է գեղարվեստական գրականության մեջ օգտագործված մեմախոսությունների և երկխոսությունների միջոցով: Ներհակական և պատճառական ցուցիչները չեն իրականացնում լայն հաղորդակցական գործառույթ, երբ մեծապես կախված են լինում համատեքստից, այնինչ հաղորդակցական գործառույթի դերը մեծանում է, երբ կախվածությունը համատեքստից նվազում է:

Լ. МАРДОЯН – *Корреляция противительных и каузативных маркеров дискурса.* – В статье рассматривается проблема корреляции противительных и каузативных маркеров дискурса. Для изучения функционально-коммуникативных особенностей вышеупомянутых маркеров дискурса исследуются примеры монологов и диалогов в художественной литературе. В случае сильной зависимости от контекста коммуникативная роль противительных и каузативных маркеров уменьшается, а низкая зависимость от контекста, напротив, повышает их коммуникативную роль.