

УДК 811.111"367:82-3

INTERJECTION IMPACT ON DISCOURSE PRAGMATICS

Mykhaylenko V. V.

Ivano-Frankivsk University of Law named after King Danylo Galytskyi

The article addresses a range of issues centering on interjections pragmatic markers of discourse. The interjection wow, the object of our investigation, expressing the speaker's state of mind like 'being extraordinary, outstanding successful, excited, pleased, surprised, admired, amazed etc.', was registered in COCA, the American corpus in Spoken English (the total number is 9478 cases). They are still perfunctorily considered among miscellaneous phenomena. Though used as a part of a sentence interjections are able to change drastically the meaning of the sentence or discourse they also actualize their ethnic-cultural component. The present research is focused on the interjections as a means of expressing the mental state of the Speaker/Hearer to the utterance at the present moment of speaking. Accordingly, the interjection represents the concept of "feeling". The suggested approach is significant for speech pragmatics, wherein it is used as a speech act, and a pragmatic component of discourse in the compressed form.

Key words: interjection, sentence, discourse, concept, pragmatics, speaker/hearer.

Михайленко В. В. Вплив вигуків на прагматику дискурсу. Зміна дослідницьких парадигм у мовознавстві, як і зміна методичних парадигм в методології викладання мови, не впливає на статус вигуків в мовній системі та мовленні. Його опис залишається поверхневим і маргінальним. Проте вигук в структурі речення здатний повністю змінити значення всього речення, як і всього дискурсу, коли він вжитий як незалежне речення. У статті вигук розглядається як засіб передачі стану мовця на момент говоріння. Відповідно, він виступає репрезентантом концепту «почуття», що може впливати на прагматику дискурсу. Запропонований підхід дуже важливий для мовної прагматики, де вигук виступає мовним актом, для прагматичної складової дискурсу, а також для теорії і практики перекладу, де він може представляти ставлення мовця/слухача до висловлюваного в компресованому вигляді.

Ключові слова: вигуків, прагматика, речення, дискурс, концепт, мовець/слухач.

Михайленко В. В. Влияние междометия на прагматику дискурса. Смена исследовательских парадигм в языкознании, как и смена методических парадигм в методологии преподавания языка, не влияет на статус междометия в языке и речи. Его освещение остаётся поверхностным и маргинальным. Однако междометие в структуре предложения способно полностью изменить значение всего предложения, равно как и всего дискурса, когда оно употреблено как независимое предложение. В статье междометие рассматривается как средство передачи состояния говорящего на момент говорения. Соответственно, оно выступает репрезентантом концепта «чувство» и может влиять на прагматику дискурса. Предлагаемый подход очень важен для речевой прагматики, где междометие выступает речевым актом, для прагматической составляющей дискурса, а также для теории и практики перевода, где оно может представлять отношение говорящего/слушающего к высказыванию в компрессируемом виде.

Ключевые слова: междометие, прагматика, предложение, дискурс, концепт, говорящий/слушающий.

Formulation of the problem. An assumption of triviality of interjections in the language system remains as a constant value therefore they are still perfunctorily considered among miscellaneous phenomena [3, 85–98; 9, 101–118; 8, 101–118]. Though used as a part of a sentence interjection is able to change drastically the meaning of the sentence, or used as an autonomous sentence it may reverse pragmatic meaning of its discourse. Francis P. Dinneen [7, 114–115] specifies the implicit character if the interjection meaning: "it is not explicitly defined, but is distinguished from an adverb, with which the Greeks identified it, by reason of syntactic independence it shows and because of its emotive meaning". An interjection is a word put into a sentence to show some sudden feeling or emotion. It does not refer to anything, but simply expresses the speaker's emotion or wish, cf. a full definition of interjection given in Merriam Web-

ster's: 1.a: the act of uttering exclamations: ejaculation; 1.b: the act of putting in between: interposition; 2: an ejaculatory utterance usually lacking grammatical connection: as a: a word or phrase used in exclamation (as *Heavens! Dear me!*); b: a cry or inarticulate utterance (*Alas! Ouch! Phooey! Ugh!*) expressing an emotion; 3: something that is interjected or that interrupts.

We shall take into account only one type emotive or expressive interjections for instance, *wow*, expressing positive feelings and emotions in Informal Conversational English. It is a detached part of a sentence, or standing completely on its own, it is not connected to the subsequent sentence by anything other than context. It is followed by an *exclamation* mark, adding excitement to the utterance. Its frequency of usage is very by people of different social and age groups and, consequently, this fact may blur its original meaning and turns it into a marker of the speaker's state of mind.

According to their derivational pattern, English interjections are as a rule divided into primary (simple)

and secondary (derivative). Primary interjections (ah, hush, oh, ouch, ugh, wow) stem from reflex involuntary exclamations and sounds that represent the speaker's immediate reaction to a certain event. Contrary to reflex exclamations and sounds that do not belong to the language, interjections is linguistic signs, conventional in a certain language community, intelligible for its members, since these signs convey a certain meaning.

Interjections, for instance, *duh, oh, oops, ha, yikes, whoa, geez, yum, oy, eh, wow, yo, yippee, alas, dear, oh, huh-huh, phew, indeed, cool, wicked, oops, ouch, gee, oh, ah, ooh, eh, ugh, aw, yo, wow, brr, sh, and yippee* are a form, brief, such as one syllable, word, phrase, or even a short clause used most often as exclamations or parts of an exclamation [5, 188–189; 13, 115; 15, 232]. Aside from that, they are usually (but not always) placed at the beginning of a sentence. The importance of interjections lies in the fact that they can convey feelings that may sometimes be neglected in the sentence [13, 115; 5, 188–189]. The interjection is a part of speech which is more commonly used in informal language than in formal writing or speech. Basically, the function of interjections is to express emotions or sudden bursts of feelings. They can express a wide variety of emotions such as: excitement, joy, surprise, or disgust, they can serve as a marker of the speaker's ethnic-cultural characteristic or national identity. Thus, the relevance of our study lies in the foregoing.

Analysis of recent research. An English *interjection* is a shortutterance, according to Lars Nordgren [16, 185], it can be viewed as a sentence to that usually expresses emotion and is capable of standing alone. Interjections are generally considered one of the traditional parts of speech. Felix Ameka stresses that interjections are little words, or “non-words” which syntactically can occur by themselves non-elliptically as one word utterances, (semantically) refer to mental acts, expressing the speaker's mental state, action or attitude to a situation and (pragmatically) encode speaker's attitudes and communicative intentions and are context-bound [1, 107]. His main theoretical point of the research is to demonstrate two things: first, those interjections like other linguistic signs have meanings which can be rigorously stated. He also focuses on two classes of interjections: the conative ones which are directed at an auditor, and the fatic ones which are used in the maintenance of social and communicative contact [2, 245–246], and they can be termed as partner-oriented semiotic devices [21, 517–518]. Semantically, interjections are as a rule divided into two classes: those expressing emotions (emotional interjections) and those expressing inducement (imperative interjections). The research proves that the first class is formed by an overwhelming number of items, whereas the second is less numerous (*come on, here, hey, hush, lo, etc.*).

Anna Wierzbicka [23, 290] defining the concept of ‘interjection’ points out that interjection is a language unit: (1) it can be used as on its own, (2) it expresses a specifiable meaning, (3) it does not include other signs (with a specifiable meaning), (4) it is not homophonous with another lexical item that would be perceived as semantically related to it, and (5) it refers to the speaker's current mental state or mental act (for example, I feel..., I want..., I think..., I know...).

The presentation of the main research material. In spite of the interjections marginal place many linguists have given them, owing to their phonological, morphological and syntactic anomalies over the history of linguistics interjections have been accompanied by much speculation and polemics about their semantic content. Most scholars have regarded them as elements without a semantic content and given several reasons to prove this. In pragmatics, the relevance theoretic analysis of interjections proposed by Tim Wharton [19] has adhered and supported their non-conceptual description and, therefore, reinterpreted their semantics in procedural terms. According to those authors, interjections would be incomplete or defective speech acts that only show the speaker's illocutionary force toward an implicit content that must be recovered through inference. Hermann Gelhaus [10, 369] admits that interjections are denied a lexical meaning and a grammatical status [7, 17]. The emotionality of interjections is however not a reliable criterion to distinguish them from segmentation or hesitation markers; not all interjections have an emotional component but can refer to other cognitive states as well [20; 14]. Ulrice Strange also describes interjections as means of expressing emotions [18, 25–31].

Other investigators, on the contrary, have defended that interjections must have some conceptual content [20; 21; 22; 4, 241–241]. With their proposals P. David Wilkins [22] and Anna Wierzbicka [23; 24] clearly positioned themselves in opposition to those authors who claimed that interjections are not speech acts because they lack an illocutionary dictum and cannot be reported by verbs of saying [1; 2; 4, 85–98.]. But those like *gee, wow, oops, or ha* are of what Erving Goffman calls “response cries” [11, 99] are exclamatory interjections which are not full-fledged words”.

It has already been mentioned that interjections differ from other parts of speech in that they express nomination in a peculiar way. This property plays a crucial part to differentiate between interjections and their homonyms and between interjections and emotive lexical words, for example, the adjectives *super, gorgeous, awesome*, uttered with a certain intonation, though expressing the speaker's attitude to some event, still may not be qualified as interjections, since they express a qualitative evaluation of some phenomena and, consequently, have a definite logical lexical meaning. Ulrice Strange groups interjections into primary and secondary, expressive, conative, phatic, expletive and onomatopoeia [20, 8–9, 14–16].

Eventually the end-goal of the present paper is to reveal the correlation of primary interjection impact upon the sentence and discourse pragmatics. We believe that as discourse markers they can correlate with their discourse on the pragmatic level. The fact is that a traditional thesis that interjections occur in isolation as exclamation, or are loosely added on to a sentence, can be correct only on the grammatical level.

All languages have some special words (interjections) which are used to express “cognitively-based feelings”, i.e., feelings linked with specific words, such as *gee, wow, or yuk* in English [16, 89] “Every interjection has a core meaning – expressive meaning” which, in my belief, can be actualized in a corresponding con-

text only, "if the speaker had not experienced the event that preceded the utterance s/he would not have uttered in the first place" [4, 185]. The shared meaning of all such words can be represented as follows: "I feel something now" or "Because I think something now" [23, 291]. They can function, Neal R. Norrick says, as pragmatic markers which prototypically occur in turn-initial position; they differ in this way from characteristically utterance-internal modal particles in those languages like German and Dutch [17, 160].

The interjection *wow*, the object of our investigation, expressing the speaker's state of mind like 'being extraordinary, outstanding successful, excited, pleased, surprised, admired, amazed, etc. was registered in COCA, the American corpus in Spoken English (the total number is 9478 cases). And they may occur:

(1) In the initial position of the sentence:

1.1. *Wow, this is different, this is exciting, this is fun, then.*

1.2. *Wow, you know, they don't yeah, and that was our war.*

1.3. *Wow, this place really looks like Nam.*

Interjections may stand alone as complete turns, but when interjections introduce an utterance, they often function as parallel pragmatic markers of affect in Fraser's term (1996).

(2) In the medial position especially after the verb of utterance:

2.1. *It wasn't the kind of appointment you look at and say "Wow", they've put somebody in there.*

(3) In the final position:

3.1. *You finally say to yourself, "Wow". You know, it's, you know, you've worked 21 years.*

The interjection in the medial position is used in the reported speech or the speaker's monologue.

(4) As an autonomous sentence:

4.1. *Wow! That's unreal!*

4.2. *Wow. That's so cute.*

4.3. *Wow. Oh, my goodness.*

4.4. *Wow. That can't be good.*

The interjection as an autonomous sentence requires the following exclamatory sentences. Therefore, the there is a correlation of both sentences in discourse.

Tim Wharton considers that an interjection is capable of constituting an utterance by itself in a unique, non-elliptical manner [22, 73]. M. Joseph Cuenca adopts a prototype approach to categories, in which interjections are considered a context-sensitive peripheral class of the category "sentence" [6, 29–44] that typically encode pragmatic meanings [1, 101–118].

In illustrations 1–4 there is an injection expressing wonder, amazement, or great pleasure.

(5) A constituent of the phrase with another interjection:

5.1. *Oh wow. I think that was a wise move. Yeah at this point I think*

5.2. *Oh, wow. Do you want to see your mom doing that?*

5.3. *Oh, wow! Thank you.*

In illustration 5 both interjections strengthen each other: *Oh* "realization" + *wow* "being impressed/astonished". And the following sentence supports communication.

The exact feeling is not described directly but can be gleaned from the content of the thought on which the feeling is based. Interjections expressing the speaker's mental state or mental act can be classified on the basis of the exact nature of that state or act: emotive (I feel something); volitive (I want something) or informational equivalent (I want you to do this...); cognitive (I know something or I think something) or (I now know this...). A common property for expressive interjections is that they relate to the expression of emotion and cognition [18, 171, 185].

The primary function of interjections is understood as the expression of their core semantics in a specified context [18, 188]. Neal R. Norrick stresses that interjections are generally expressions of affect showing little or no association with specific pragmatic functions [17, 166]. Then due to their core semantics we can refer them to the concept representing means, though Cruz admits that for many authors it is clear that interjections do not encode concepts as nouns, verbs or adjectives do. Interjections can and do refer to something related to the speaker or to the external world, but their referential process is not the same as that of lexical items belonging to the grammatical categories mentioned, for the referent of interjections is difficult to pin down" [4, 243]. Nevertheless in the process of investigating interjections like *yuk, eh, oh, wow*. or *ouch* he comes to the conclusion that: "yet, on many occasions those interjections seem to behave in a way that very much resembles symbols, this would suggest that such interjections could encode some sort of concept, even if vague or general, which hearers would have to subsequently determine through inference" [4, 246].

The class of interjections demonstrates the open-ended nature which can be proved by numerous 'secondary' interjections. Interjections are grouped by Neal R. Norrick with exclamatives as items which signal both surprise and either positive or negative affect: thus, interjections may signal either undifferentiated surprise, as in *boy, wow, ooh*, or surprise along with frustration, as in *in god, hell, man*, or surprise along with pleasure, as in *yippee* and *hurrah* [15, 165].

Some writers use the term "discourse marker" to cover roughly this same set of items, but according to Deborah Schiffrin, discourse markers constitute only a proper sub-class of pragmatic markers, namely those which signal the relation of the basic move to the foregoing turn [10, 101–118]. She defines discourse markers: "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" [19, 31].

We must say that interjections have not any functions of discourse markers or discourse particles; because they express their core semantics in a specified context conveying the speaker's feeling [12, 78–122]. They positively or negatively express the speaker's attitude to the hearer and the utterance which cause the changes in the semantics and structure of the subsequent sentence or discourse. But mainly the pragmatics of interjections closely correlates with pragmatics of discourse.

Conclusions and prospects for further research.

We hope to have shown that interjections are semantically tractable and that they constitute a nexus for a host of important and complex issues concerning emotional

expression. A comprehensive treatment of interjections will require serious and sustained multidisciplinary collaboration. Interjections display a range of functions beyond simply registering affect.

Of course, there must be an extensive investigation to empirically prove that interjections encode some con-

cept. It will overhaul the theory of interjection, its status in language system and discourse structure.

Although English interjections may seem trivial, the reality is that this part of speech is very important because it can sometimes be difficult to express emotions in oral and written forms.

REFERENCES

1. Ameka F. K. Interjections: The Universal yet neglected part of speech / F. K. Ameka // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1992. – Vol. 18. – P. 101–118.
2. Ameka F. K. The Meaning of phatic and conative interjections / F. K. Ameka // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1992. – Vol. 18. – P. 245–271.
3. Calvo P. J. Interjecciones! / J. C. Perez // Enric Serra et al. (eds.) // *Panorama de la Investigación Lingüística a l'Estat Espanyol. Actes del I Congrés de Lingüística General, III*. – Valencia : Universitat de València, 1996. – P. 85–98.
4. Cruz M. P. Might Interjections Encode Concepts? More Questions Than Answers / M. P. Cruz // *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. – 2009. – Vol. 5. – № 2. – P. 241–270.
5. Crystal D. *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* / D. Crystal. – Oxford : John Wiley & Sons, 2011. – 560 p.
6. Cuenca M. J. Defining the Indefinable? Interjections / M. J. Cuenca // *Syntaxis*. – 2000. – № 3. – P. 29–44.
7. Dinneen F. P. *An Introduction to General Linguistics* / F. P. Dinneen. – Washington, DC : Georgetown University Press, 1978. – 452 p.
8. Fischer K. From Cognitive Semantics to Lexical Pragmatics. The Functional Polysemy of Discourse Particles / K. Fischer. – Amsterdam : Walter de Gruyter, 2000. – 374 p.
9. Fischer K. Interjections. The Universal Yet Neglected Part of Speech / F. Fischer // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1992. – Vol. 18 – P. 101–118.
10. Fraser B. Pragmatic Markers / B. Fraser // *Pragmatics*. – 1996. – № 6. – P. 101–118.
11. Gelhaus H. *Die Wortarten* / H. Gelhaus // *Duden: Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. 5th ed. – Mannheim : Dudenverlag, 1995. – P. 85–398.
12. Goffman E. *Response Cries* / E. Goffman // *Forms of Talk*. – Oxford : Blackwell, 1981. – P. 78–122.
13. Hartmann R. R. K. *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* / R. R. K. Hartmann, F. C. Stork. – New York : John Wiley & Sons, 1972. – 302 p.
14. Malmkjaer K. *Linguistics Encyclopedia* / K. Malmkjaer. – London : Routledge, 2003. – 600 p.
15. Mykhaylenko V. *A Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies* / V. Mykhaylenko. – Ivano-Frankivsk : King Danylo Galytskyi University of Law, 2015. – 528 p.
16. Nordgren L. *Greek Interjections: Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics* / L. Nordgren. – Berlin, New York : Walter de Gruyter, 2015. – 282 p.
17. Norrick N. R. Discussion Article: Pragmatic Markers, Interjections and Discourse / N. R. Norrick // *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*. – 2007. – Vol. 6. – P. 159–168.
18. Romero J. Discourse markers / J. Romero // Keith Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. – Oxford : Elsevier, 2006. – P. 2–639.
19. Schiffrin D. *Discourse Markers* / D. Schiffrin. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 364 p.
20. Stange U. *Emotive Interjections in British English: A Corpus-based Study on Variation in Acquisition, Function and Usage* / U. Stange. – Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2016. – 221 p.
21. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* / [T. Karen, I. Cornelia, S. Todd (eds.)]. – New York : John Wiley & Sons, 2015. – 1660 p.
22. Wharton T. *Pragmatics and Non-Verbal Communication* / T. Wharton. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 219 p.
23. Wierzbicka A. *Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and Universals* / A. Wierzbicka. – Cambridge : CUP, 1999. – 349 p.
24. Wierzbicka A. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction or hesitation markers* / A. Wierzbicka. – Berlin ; New York : Walter de Gruyter, 2003. – 502 p.
25. Wilkins D. Interjections as Deictics / D. Wilkins // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 1992. – Vol.18. – P. 119–158.