

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS EXPRESSING ADVERSATIVE RELATIONS IN ENGLISH, MACEDONIAN AND ALBANIAN LANGUAGE

Edona Vinca

State University "Mother Teresa", Skopje, Macedonia.

E-mail: edonavinca@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Discourse markers as linguistic elements in most cases can be found in spoken interactions. However, they also have a key role in written texts. They are also called pragmatic markers, discourse particles, discourse operators etc. Most authors agree that there are three types of discourse markers: contrastive: but, however, instead, etc., elaborative: and, furthermore, in addition, etc and inferential discourse markers:so, thus, as a result, etc.). The lack of research on the topic of discourse markers in Albanian and Macedonian language was the reason behind choosing adversative discourse markers as the subject to be analyzed. Hence, this paper deals with contrastive discourse markers by doing contrastive analysis of these types of discourse markers through the example of the discourse marker on the contrary, and its translation equivalents in Albanian and Macedonian language. During the research, sampled sentences gathered from written texts in three languages were analyzed through Fraser's hypothesis on the two interpretations of the contrastive discourse marker and proved specific points on the adversative relations expressed by it in these three languages (English, Macedonian, and Albanian).

Key words: discourse, marker, adversative, contrastive, on the contrary.

Introduction

Discourse markers are also called pragmatic markers, discourse particles, discourse connectors, discourse operator, discourse connectors etc. As linguistic elements, discourse markers have been treated and defined differently by different authors. However, the majority of the authors agree that discourse markers in most cases can be found in spoken interaction, even though they may play important roles in written texts as well. (Hoey, 2001).

Schiffrin defines discourse markers as linguistic expressions composed of words such as conjunctions: *and, but, or*; adverbs: *now, then*, lexicalized expressions: *you know, I mean*. (Schiffrin et al. 2001). Her analysis shows that markers may function on several discourse levels and may serve to connect utterances.

Fraser is another author who has dealt with discourse markers, wanting to find out more about how markers in a sentence connect the message conveyed by that sentence to the message conveyed by the previous sentence (cited in Schiffrin et al., 2001). According to him, such expressions do not contribute semantically to the specific discourse segment but signal the connection between the speaker and the previous utterance. The words in bold in the following sentences are discourse markers.

- (1) *The water wouldn't boil, **so** we couldn't make any tea.*
 - (2) *It rained at the picnic. **And** the beer was warm.*
- (Fraser, 2009)

As stated above, discourse markers are commonly treated as expressions found in spoken interactions. However, these elements may also be found in written texts as essential elements. It is because of this that we say that discourse markers play an important part in written texts.

The idea that discourse markers express structural connection between parts of texts comes from Halliday and Hassan (1976). In their book *Cohesion in English* they examine what we know today as discourse markers in relation to text cohesion, including expressions such as *and, but, because, I mean, by the way*, but calling them *conjunctive devices*. They propose a complex taxonomy for this so called devices, according to the type of conjunction (temporal, causal, adversative etc.) they can be on an *ideational level*, meaning connection between language and the world, or on an *internal* or *interpersonal* level, meaning connection between the language and the hearer/ audience. (Halliday and Hassan, 1976)

The majority of the authors agree that there are three types of discourse markers: contrastive: *but, however, instead...*, elaborative: *and, furthermore, in addition...* and inferential discourse markers: *so, thus, as a result...* with discourse markers *but* and *and* as the most general discourse markers of every type. (Fraser 2006).

Contrastive Discourse Markers

According to Fraser (Fraser, 2013), there are two groups of contrastive markers: those signaling a General Contrastive relationship between S2 and S1 (*but, although, however, yet, still, nevertheless, only, except*), and those signaling a Specific Contrastive

relationship between S1 and S2 (*on the other hand, instead, conversely, in contrast, rather, on the contrary, alternatively*).

There is a subcategory of contrastive discourse markers in English consisting of *on the contrary* and the less frequent *to the contrary* and *quite the contrary*. (Fraser, 2009).

According to Fraser (Fraser, 2013), there are two possible interpretations to *on the contrary*. The first signals that S2 challenges or denies the message of S1, which is often expressed as a negative, and provides a correct interpretation in S2, as in (3). The second meaning takes the meaning of S1 and moves the meaning to an extreme, as in (4).

- (3) A: *I don't suppose you remember where they are, do you?*
B: *On the contrary, my dear Watson, I know exactly where they are.*

- (4) *You ask if I'm hungry. **On the contrary**, I'm starved.*
(Fraser, 2013)

Relevance and Previous Research

The relevance of discourse markers in the field of discourse analysis and pragmatics is increasing in the past years. Moreover, contrastive analysis comparing English discourse markers to those used in Albanian and Macedonian language may prove to be very useful, since this is a field which has not been researched in enough detail in these two languages.

This paper discusses contrastive discourse markers and their function in written texts in three languages (English, Macedonian and Albanian). In the interest of complying with the word limitation of this paper, only the case of *on the contrary* is seen in closer detail. As was said before, the vast majority of the research related to discourse markers includes spoken communication, even though there is indication that these linguistic elements are important factors in writing. (Hoey, 2001; Halliday, Hasan, 1976)

As was mentioned before, contrastive discourse markers have not been tackled in enough scrutiny in Macedonian and Albanian.

In English, there are several papers giving certain conclusions on this field. These papers served as basis for analyzing the usage of contrastive discourse markers in Albanian and Macedonian written texts and compare the functions with those of the English equivalents.

Werner (Werner, 2017) researched contrastive discourse markers in the context of learning a foreign language concluding that adversative discourse markers may be categorized as difficult for the learners, even though there is variability in the data where for several students the usage of adversative discourse markers showed to be on a good level.

Fraser (Fraser, 2013) gives a general division of the contrastive discourse markers into two categories based on the connection they make between S1 and S2. This distinction enabled us to view the roles of the discourse marker *on the contrary* that served us with the analysis of the Macedonian and Albanian translation equivalent of this adversative discourse marker.

In the pragmatic analysis of the contrastive discourse marker *ama* (but) in speech acts used for disagreement in Macedonian language, Kusevska considers that 'ama' has a significant pragmatic function.

Namely it can emphasize disagreement, mirror the uncertainty of the speaker and his/her stance and it is not used only in cases of disagreement. All these conclusions come from research carried out for spoken communication and are crucial in the field of adversative discourse markers.

Meniku (Mëniku, 2013) in a paper concerning discourse markers in the Albanian language where she calls discourse markers 'text connectors' gives a short overview of adversative discourse markers in general using semantic, morphological and syntactic descriptions and examples.

The goal of this paper is to discuss adversative discourse markers in written texts in English, Albanian and Macedonian and determine similarities and differences in function using the example of the discourse marker *on the contrary* in written texts through contrastive analysis, by using quantitative and qualitative analysis.

The main hypothesis is that the discourse marker *on the contrary* has two possible interpretations in written texts in English, Macedonian and Albanian language.

In order to compare our results with Fraser's hypothesis (Fraser, 2013) that the discourse marker *on the contrary* has two possible interpretations, these two interpretations were treated as Interpretation One and Two, where Interpretation One was the one where the discourse marker challenges and negates the message conveyed in S1, which is in most cases expressed by a negation, and gives a correct interpretation of S2, and Interpretation Two, the interpretation in which the speaker takes the meaning of S1 and hyperbolizes it in S2.

The research question at stake was the following:

Does the discourse marker *on the contrary* in written texts in Albanian and Macedonian have the same functions as in English?

Considering the fact that the paper is concerned with the usage of discourse markers in written texts, sentences were collected from different types of written materials in English, Macedonian and Albanian language. The sentences contain the discourse marker *on the contrary*. After the sample was formed, the sentences were analyzed in order to determine whether the given hypothesis is true.

The analysis firstly examined the syntactic position of the discourse marker in the sentence, namely whether it has initial, medial or final position, in order to determine whether the position of this marker is similar in all of the three languages.

Then, the function and meaning of the discourse marker was examined according to the theory proposed by Fraser (Fraser, 2013). All the sentences of the sample were analyzed to see whether there are similarities to the conclusion given by Fraser for the English language.

The limitation of the research is on the limited number of sampled sentences. In order to have conclusions which will be more accurate the sample should be wider, or in other words, in the future it is planned for this research to be broadened by gathering more sampled questions in all three languages.

The Macedonian *on the contrary*- НАПРОТИВ

In the Digital Dictionary of the Macedonian Language, the word *напротив* is defined as an adverb with the following meaning: *contrary, opposite, not like that, but contrary to that*.

Examples of usage of the adverb *напротив*:

- (5) Во песната тие зборови не звучат лошо, *напротив* тие прават едно убаво поетично единство.
*In the poem those words do not sound badly, **on the contrary** they make a beautiful poetic unity.*
- (6) Сакаше со тоа да го поправи впечатокот, *напротив* излезе уште полошо.
*She wanted to improve the impression with that; **on the contrary** she made herself look even worse.*

(*Digital Dictionary of the Macedonian Language. makedonski.info*)

Even though the word *нанротув* is generally treated as an adverb, in several articles of the field of discourse analysis and pragmatics in Macedonian language, there are indications that this word may be considered as an adversative discourse marker together with the word 'ама' - *but* (Kusevska).

In the sampled sentences it is clear that this adverb is a discourse marker.

Interpretation One	Interpretation Two
(100%)	(0%)

It can be seen from the sample that in the Macedonian language Interpretation Two for the adversative discourse marker *нанротув* (*on the contrary*) does not apply.

As for the syntactic position of the discourse marker *нанротув*, it can be said that in the majority of the cases (80 % of the sentences), in the written texts in Macedonian, the adversative discourse marker *нанротув* has a medial position in the sentence.

Initial	Medial	Final
(0%)	(80%)	(20%)

As Kusevska states, in order to achieve their goal, adversative discourse markers can be enforced by other markers, such as in Macedonian *туку*, (*but also*). This is evident in the sampled sentences (20% of sentences have an additional adversative discourse marker). However, in most of the sentences, the adversative discourse marker *нанротув* is not accompanied by any other marker.

Presence of another marker	No other marker
(20%)	(80%)

The Albanian on the contrary-PËRKUNDRAZI

Here we have an interpretation of the word *përkundraziby* Meniku (Mëniku, 2013), who treats this word as a *discourse connector*.

Meniku looks at *përkundrazifrom* a morphological, semantic and syntactic perspective. From a morphological point of view, the word *përkundrazi* is a particle consisting of the preposition *për* (lit. for) + adverb *kundra* (lit. against) + suffix *zi*. (Mëniku, 2013:146)

From a semantic point of view, this word indicates an activity, state or a situation contrary to the one that may be imagined or to the one that has been described

previously. The element of disagreement or contrast is expressed by the adverb *kundër* (against).

In traditional syntax of the Albanian language, the word *përkundraz* falls under the category of *words serving for mediation*, and is classified as a word used for opposing a certain word, or for opposing or negating what was described previously.

(7) *Mosishtediçka e papritur? Përkundrazi, këtë e kishim marrëvesh me kohë.*
Was it something unexpected? **On the contrary**, we knew about this long time ago. (Mëniku, 2013:146)

According to Meniku, such type of syntactic function of the word *përkundrazi* is sufficient to allow its treatment as a (as she names it) *textual connector* expressing a relation of adversativeness *against what was being expected*. She continues with the explanation that the part of the sentence where this connector is located is more prominent, and because of this a comma is used when in initial position, or placed between two commas when in medial position in the sentence.

The analysis of the sampled sentences from written texts in Albanian language showed that Interpretation Two is completely absent. Namely, the adversative discourse marker *përkundrazi* (on the contrary) in all the sentences has an adversative role.

Interpretation One	Interpretation Two
(100%)	(0%)

As for the position of *përkundrazi*, it is noticed that it can be found in all positions, but most commonly in medial position.

Initial	Medial	Final
(30%)	(60%)	(10%)

In only 10 % of the sampled sentences, the adversative discourse marker *përkundrazi* is accompanied by another discourse marker, such as the marker *por* (but).

The English on the contrary

In the sampled sentences from English texts, it is observed that most of the cases fall under the f Interpretation One. Also, it is observed that the adversative discourse marker *on the contrary* may be found only in initial position.

It is observed that it may be accompanied by another marker such as *but*.

Interpretation One (90%)	Interpretation Two (10%)
-----------------------------	-----------------------------

Initial Position (60%)	Medial Position (40%)	Final Position (0%)
---------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Presence of another marker (10%) -but	No other marker present (90%)
--	----------------------------------

Conclusions

The sampled sentences were analyzed to see whether there are two possible interpretations to the adversative discourse marker *on the contrary* as defined by Fraser.

POSITION COMPARISON			
	Initial	Medial	Final
Macedonian	0 %	70 %	20 %
Albanian	30 %	60 %	10 %
English	60 %	40 %	0 %

According to the analysis of the sampled sentences, in written texts in English *on the contrary* is not found in final position, whereas in Albanian and Macedonian there are examples where this adversative discourse marker is found in final position.

Most of the sentences ending in this adversative discourse marker in Macedonian and Albanian language are found in newspaper titles, serving to achieve the journalistic goal of giving the impression that the text to follow is contrasting specific ideas.

MEANING COMPARISON		
	Interpretation 1	Interpretation 2
Macedonian	100 %	0 %
Albanian	100 %	0 %
English	90 %	10 %

The analysis showed that most of the sentences from all three languages contain an adversative discourse marker falling under Interpretation 1 of the categories from Fraser's hypothesis. This shows that the theory does not apply to the sampled sentences in English, Macedonian and Albanian.

References

1. Fraser, B. *Combinations of Contrastive Discourse Markers in English*. International Review of Pragmatics 5. 2013: 318-340
2. Fraser, B. *Pragmatic markers in contrast*. Elsevier. 2006:73-92
3. Fraser, B. *Pragmatic Markers*. Pragmatics. 1996: 167-190
4. Fraser, B. *The English Contrastive Discourse Marker On the Contrary*. Language in Life and a Life in Language: Jacob Mey- A Festschrift Edited by Ken Turner and Bruce Fraser. 2009
5. Halliday, M.A.K, and Hasan, R. *Cohesion in English*. Longman. 1976
6. Hoey, M. *Textual Interaction: An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. Routledge. 2001
7. Mënuku, L. *Konektorët e tekstit në gjuhën shqipe*. Universiteti i Tiranës, Fakulteti i Historisë dhe i Filologjisë. 2013
8. Schiffrin, D, Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishers. 2001
9. Schourup, L. *Discourse Markers*. Lingua. 1999: 227-265
10. Werner, V. *Adversative Pragmatic Markers in Learner Language: A Cross-Sectional Perspective*. Corpus Pragmatics. 2017: 135-158

In Cyrillic

Кусевска, Марија. *Дискурсниот маркер ама: прагматичка анализа на неговата употреба во говорните чинови на несогласување.*