

IN OTHER WORDS: REFORMULATION STRATEGIES IN DOSTOEVSKII'S LITERARY WORKS

BENAMÍ BARROS GARCÍA

bbarros@ugr.es

Abstract

This study aims to explore characteristic linguistic patterns to express narrowing, correction and reformulation in Dostoevskii's literary works. Particular attention is paid to the description of the function, meaning and features of these discourse markers in relation to the mental representations they evoke. The high frequency of discourse markers in Dostoevskii's literary works seems to be related to his constant control over speech, especially over the collision and overlap of mental representations that occur during reading. For that reason, this article tends to be framed within the scope of the negotiation of meaning during literary text comprehension in the general context of the relationships between language, culture and discourse in Russian. The proposed analysis may therefore contribute not only to the study of Dostoevskii's works and poetics, but also to the comprehension and explanation of discursive mechanisms of reformulation in Russian.

Keywords: *F.M. Dostoevskii; Discourse Analysis; Mental Representations; Discourse Markers; Semantic Narrowing; Correction; Reformulation.*

1. Introduction

The present study focuses on Dostoevskii's tendency to use discourse markers (DMs) (Schiffrin 1987, 2001; Fraser 1990, 1999; Jucker 1993; Jucker, Ziv 1998; Portolés 1998, 2005; Martín Zorraquino, Portolés 1999;

Blakemore 2002, 2004; Fischer 2006; Pons Bordería 2006, 2008; Aschenberg & Loureda Lamas 2011), especially for expressing correction, narrowing and reformulation (Blakemore 1993, 2007; Culpeper 1994; Pons Bordería 1998; Cuenca 2003; Maruenda 2002; Murillo Ornat 2004; Cuenca, Bach 2007). Despite the lack of terminological consensus and shared definitions in this heterogeneous field, there is general agreement that DMs such as *well*, *right*, *I mean*, *that is*, *mind you* and others are crucial resources in guiding the communication process (Vande Casteele, Collewaert, 2013). The usage of these linguistic resources provides cohesion to the discourse and cannot be isolated from the situational context of the utterance. It is worth noting that these discursive phenomena tend to represent a higher level of spontaneity in literary communication, bringing it closer to oral speech. Examination of the discourse markers typically used by Dostoevskii helps not only to understand the way literary communication occurs within the elusive poetics of this author (among many others, Bakhtin 1963, 1986; Wellek 1980; Jones 1990; Jackson 1993; Emerson 1995, 1997, 1999), but also the way in which the reader (re)creates meaning (among many others, Boulenger et al. 2009, 2012; Dissanayake, Brown 2009; Miall 2009; Barsalou 2008; Herman 2010; Bailey, Zacks 2011; Bernaerts et al. 2013; Zwaan 2014).

With this in mind, it is important to note the lack of extensive literature on Russian DMs (Nikitin 1949; Baranov Kobozeva 1984; Baranov et al. 1993; Kiseleva, Paillard 1998, 2003; Kobozeva 1999; Nikolaeva 2008; Paillard 2006; Kibrik, Podlesskaia 2005; Kibrik, Savel'eva-Trofimova 2008; Khatchaturyan 2008; Bogdanova 2012), that traditionally have been analyzed as particles (“chastnitsy”),¹ modal words (“modal'nye slova”), parasitic words (“slova-parasity”), parenthetical or introductory words (“vvodnye slova”) or discursive words/expressions (“diskursivnye slova/vyrazheniia”). It might be appropriate to extend the approach proposed by Shmelev (2005) in order to frame them within the world view of the Russian language. Such a representational or cognitive approach to the study of DMs in Russian could certainly shed light on the linguistic particularities of this language, and on the way in which the world is perceived, conceptualized and verbalized in Russian.

It is important to highlight that this study concerns a fictional universe, in which the question of truth or falsehood of the utterances under scrutiny has no place, as the whole text is pronounced, as if it were, backed by the discourse that states what exists, without this actually being so, at least in the possibilities of the worlds belonging to the work. As there is a considerable literature on issues such as *overjustification effects*, fictional contract, suspension of disbelief, and on the fictional paradox, it must be assumed that in the proposition Y is X, Y should be defined in an expanded domain, created in/by X and non-X.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5124597>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5124597>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)