

### Список використаних джерел:

1. Крейндин Г. Е. Невербальная коммуникация: язык тела и естественный язык. – М.: Новое литератур. обозрение, 2002. – 592 с.
2. Крейндин Г. Е. Движение рук: касание и тактильное взаимодействие в коммуникации людей // Логический анализ языка. – М.: Высш. шк., 2001. – С. 377-392.
3. Кухаренко В. А. Інтерпретація тексту. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2004. – 272 с.
4. Лакофф Д. Когнитивная семантика // Язык и интеллект: Сб. / Пер. с англ. и нем. / Сост. и вступ. ст. В. В. Петрова. – М.: Прогресс, 1995. – С. 143-185.
5. Минский М. Фреймы для представления знаний: Пер. с англ. / Под. ред. Ф. М. Кулакова. – М.: Энергия, 1979. – 151 с.
6. Потапова Р. К. Коннотативная паралингвистика. М.: Триада, 1997. – 327 с.
7. Сапожников С. К. Еще раз о пользе жеста // Структуры языкового сознания / Под. ред. Ю. А. Сорокина. – М.: Наука, 1990. – 327 с.
8. Стародубцева О. А. Лексико-семантичні засоби кінетичної характеристики персонажа (на матеріалі французького роману ХХ століття): Дис. канд. ... філол. наук: 10.02.05. – Захищена 27.03.2002; Затв. 27.06.2002 – К., 2002. – 170 с. – Бібліогр.: с. 148-170.
9. Andersen P., Sull K. Out of Touch, out of Reach: Tactile Predispositions as Perictors of Interpersonal Distance // Western Journal of Speech Communication. – 1985. – № 49. – P. 57-72.
10. Argyle M. The Syntaxes of Body Communication // Linguistics. – № 112. – 1973. – P. 71-91.
11. Hall E. T. The Hidden Dimension. – N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966. – 209 p.
12. Jackendoff R. Patterns in the Mind. Language and Human Nature. – N. Y.: Basic Books, 1994. – 246 p.
13. Sommer R. The Distance for Comfortable Conversation: A Further Study // Sociometry. – 1962. – № 23. – P. 111-125.
14. Trager G. L. Paralanguage: A first approximation // Studies in linguistics. – 1958. – V. 13. № 1-2. – P. 1-13.

### Список джерел ілюстративного матеріалу:

15. Amis M. London Fields. – L.: Penguin Books, 1991. – 470 p.
16. Byatt A. S. Possession: A Romance. – L.: Vintage, 1991. – 510 p.
17. Caryl Rh. Cambridge. – L.: Picador, 1991. – 184 p.
18. Doule R. Paddy Clark Ha Ha Ha. – L.: Minerva, 1993. – 282 p.
19. McEwan I. Black Dogs. – L.: Jonathan Cape, 1992. – 174 p.

**Saienko Ya.**

*Scientific adviser: Tkachuk T.*

*Ph. D., Associate Professor,*

*Vinnitsia Institute of Trade and Economics  
of Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics*

### ADVERBS AS DISCOURSE MARKERS

Discourse markers help us during conversation, when we often begin a sentence with a word that has nothing to do with the main idea of the sentence. The word relates more to the social conventions of speaking out in a group: claiming

next turn, drawing attention to what one is about to say, or hesitating to collect one's thoughts before continuing.

Deborah Shiffrin classifies eleven discourse markers represented by string and subordinate conjunctions (and, but, or because), temporal and allied adverbs (now, then, so), particles (oh, well), introductory sentences (you know, I mean). According to D. Shiffrin, the main function of discourse markers is to ensure the text of the text: «Discriminatory markers do not create, but show the relation between the segments of discourse» [3, p. 63].

Discourse markers are minor grammatical words that we use to indicate pauses, transitions, or other aspects of communication when we are talking. They are unstressed, and occur frequently, in both formal and informal English speech.

Discourse markers organise longer pieces of conversation or text. They can mark the openings or closings of conversations, changes in topics, and other functions connected with organising a conversation or text. Most discourse markers belong to the class of adverbs [1].

*Anyway, I've got to go and pick up the children.* (signals that the conversation is finishing)

*Finally, we need to consider the broader economic issues.* (signals the last item in a list of points or arguments)

*Right, now, sorry to keep you waiting.* (signals something new)

*So you want to go to Spain, do you?* (focuses on a topic)

Discourse marker already, which is the adverb in the context of time Present Perfect implicitly suggests such a development in the future. The marker is already making a positive impact in the message on the revision of certain measures, due to its semantics completeness:

*Important improvements have already taken place, including increased cooperation among the treaty bodies, development of common working methods in several areas.*

Effective cooperation between the two countries will continue in the future. Image of time operation is hardly possible without the simultaneous expression of its distribution in time. Discourse marker already performs the function of the implications of events. Cognitive load the above units of language is the interpretation of the recipient of the link between the past, present and future [2]. With a marker already the author of the news gives the information more weight, stressing the importance of the events or the consequence of these events. Thus, the addresser extends to the present time, on the basis of which, in the future it is expected a positive result of previous actions and events.

Hyperboles are often used to enhance the impression both in domestic and in political discourse. Different politicians use hyperbole to put pressure on listeners, so their speeches become authoritarian. US President Bill Clinton has been using hyperbole in a financial crisis speech to increase the effect of his words and to exercise authoritarian pressure on the audience:

*Never has there been a more important moment to set a clear direction for the future, to affirm the commitment of Russia to democracy and to free markets, and to*

*take decisive steps to stabilize the economy and restore investor confidence (CBFC).*

In this exaggeration there is a violation of the usual order of words, the adverb with the value of absolute «never» is used in the initial position. Hyperboles are an appeal to the recipient's emotions, which increases the influence of the discourse the politicians who use them.

According to P. Brown's study, epistemic adverbs are the main markers of expression of positive / negative courtesy, since they help to establish a certain relationship between the speakers, which in turn changes the power of speech act. Example:

– (...) *it was the top half of one percent uh highly gifted, kids, uh who were followed over, i think, it's maybe sixty years now (Male)*

In this statement, we observe the combination of the epistemic adverb «maybe» with the numeral «sixty». This case is not isolated, because in academic speech the combination of epistemic adverbs «about», «almost», «around», «approximately» with numerals is popular» [4, p. 124].

A discourse marker is a word or phrase that plays important role in managing the flow and structure of discourse. Since their main function is at the level of discourse (sequences of utterances) rather than at the level of utterances or sentences, discourse markers are relatively syntax-independent and usually do not change the truth conditional meaning of the sentence.

### References:

1. Adverbs as discourse markers (anyway, finally) [Режим доступу]: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/discourse-markers/adverbs-as-discourse-markers-anyway-finally>
2. Backlund Ulf. The Collocation of Adverbs of Degree in English / Ulf. Backlund // Ulf. Backlund. – Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1973. – 145 p.
3. Schiffrin D. Discourse markers / D. Schiffrin. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987. – P. 318.
4. Brown P. How and why are women more polite: some evidence from a Mayan community/ P. Brown // S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker & N. Furman (eds.). – New York: Praeger, 1980. – Pp. 111-136.