

Lexico-Syntactic in Free Indirect Speech Connectors and the Problem of Marking the Point of View of the Narrator and Character

Evgenia V. Krasnova, Inna V. Kotelnikova, Svetlana E. Marchenko,
Irina A. Topolskaya and Renata P. Avedova

Abstract--- *The present research aims to determine the features of lexico-syntactic connectors in free indirect speech and to establish the specificity of representing the point of view of the narrator and character through the considered pragmatic markers of free indirect speech. The relevance of the study lies in the development of ideas about the formation (in the cognitive consciousness of the author and the reader) of counterpoint characters voices that form the basis of polyphonic language thinking. The research results complement the currently relevant linguistic concepts of artistic discourse. The purpose and objectives of the study are realized by such research methods as: descriptive-analytical method based on contextual analysis, conceptual analysis, and comparative method. The analysis of 3375 contexts established that the lexico-syntactic connectors can act as an effective means of creating linear continuity of free indirect speech. It is proved that sentences containing lexico-syntactic connectors receive the same interpretation in the text as in the previous context space. It is established that the lexico-syntactic connectors connect not only the preceding and the subsequent discourse segment but also different cognitive states of the character. It is argued that the connectors are triggers to shift from one point of view to another, contributing to the harmonization of different points of view. In conclusion, it is determined that the manipulation of the connecting means in the translation process can significantly affect the reader's perception of the points of view of the characters and the author's narration.*

Keywords--- *Free Indirect Speech, Means of Cohesion, Discourse, Conjunction, Connectors.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of the specifics of the functioning and organization of **free indirect speech** as a means of creating a linguistic conceptual space, despite a vast variety of studies, remains an urgent problem in modern linguistics and requires further analysis of the methods and tools to create a single space of artistic text combining the deictic and modal characteristics of the two models of discourse – the narrator and the character [1-3]. The purpose of the present study is to identify the main effective lexico-syntactic connectors which act as a link between two parallel spaces, the narrator and the character, and determine the ways of representing and marking their points of view. The purpose of the study determines the following tasks:

Evgenia V. Krasnova, Associate Professor, PhD Philol., Department of Scientific and Technical Translation and Professional Communication, Don State Technical University, 1 Gagarin Square, Rostov-on-Don.

Inna V. Kotelnikova, Associate Professor, PhD Philol., Department of Scientific and Technical Translation and Professional Communication, Don State Technical University, 1 Gagarin Square, Rostov-on-Don.

Svetlana E. Marchenko, Associate Professor, PhD Sociol., Department of Scientific and Technical Translation and Professional Communication, Don State Technical University, 1 Gagarin Square, Rostov-on-Don.

Irina A. Topolskaya, Senior Lecturer, Department of Scientific and Technical Translation and Professional Communication, Don State Technical University, 1 Gagarin Square, Rostov-on-Don.

Renata P. Avedova, Associate Professor, PhD Philol., Department of Scientific and Technical Translation and Professional Communication, Don State Technical University, 1 Gagarin Square, Rostov-on-Don.

- To identify the ability of lexico-syntactic connectors to create linear continuity of **free indirect speech**;
- Determine the functional role of elements in **free indirect speech**;
- Analyze the relationship between the frequency of elements of cohesion and the problematic characters image in the textual representation of the point of view and the subjectivity of attributing a point of view to a particular character;
- To prove the ability of lexico-syntactic connectors to identify the cognitive state of the character, actualized at the time of the story;
- To establish the relationship between the modifications of punctuation features of the original utterance and certain pragmatic goals.

The study is based on the works of I. V. Trufanova, S. Ehrlich, M. Halliday, R. Hasan and others who analyze the linguistic criteria used to identify the authors style and who touch on the problem of the sentence and its components which do not directly manifest the identified characteristics yet are interpreted as a means of expressing the characters point of view [4].

The underlying idea is the theory of S. Ehrlich, who examines the role of means of cohesion in the process of expressing a characters point of view and concludes that since these means model the cohesion of discourse, at the sentence level they perform the pragmatic function of means that ‘support’ the interpretation of the point of view [28]. In the theory of S. Ehrlich, means of cohesion are considered as markers that provide a continuous expression of a point of view in an artistic narrative. The works of M. Halliday and R. Hasan [5], and T. Reinhart [6] on the analysis of cohesion served as the methodological basis for the present research. These works analyze conjunctions which are considered as elements involved in creating and ensuring the cohesion of the text in a linear sequence.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Texts of modern English-language literature (23-26, K. Mansfield, and others) served as the material of the study. The concept of English-language literature refers to the prose of the author whose native language is English (British, Canadian and New Zealand authors). The method of continuous sampling revealed 3375 contexts representing various types of means of cohesion in free indirect speech as an authentic style of artistic narration.

The purpose and tasks indicated in the work are realized through such research methods as descriptive-analytical method based on contextual analysis direct selection of fragments of free indirect speech as a linear text sequence;

A conceptual analysis to comprehensively present many ‘voices’ of the subjects of the narrative (both the narrator and individual characters) and their the points of view, the dialogical correlation between which is manifested by lexical-syntactic connectors; comparative method to determine the general characteristics of lexical-syntactic connectors in free indirect speech and spontaneous dialogue, detailing the features of cohesion in the works of English-language authors and in their translations into Russian.

When analyzing free indirect speech as a specially arranged linear text, the authors of the present study consider each text as a definite register of literature and refer to such methods as monographic research, interpretive and

synthesizing method of analyzing the harmonious ‘docking’ of the authors and the characters voices into a single-meaning sequence through means of cohesion.

The basis of the general philosophical methodology of the study is the holistic approach to the object of study; symbolization, suggesting such contextual actualization of the object of study at which its semantic component deepens due to its association with the symbolic signified, abstracted from the usual semantics.

The general scientific basis of the research comprised the studies performed in the framework of:

1. The systemic-structural paradigm: M.M. Bakhtin [13], G.I. Bogin [14], I.R. Galperin [15], G.G. Infantova [16], O.I. Moskalskaya [17], Yu.A. Sorokin [18], Z.Ya. Turaeva [19];
2. Anthropocentric paradigm: V.V. Krasnykh [20], P. Werth [21], M. Fludernik [22].

These works are devoted to the traditional questions of the relation of experience and empiricity in the theory of narration, of the readers active construction of meaning and the imposition of a ‘cognitive framework’ in the process of interpreting the text in terms of the available schemes.

In the aspect of **private scientific methodology**, the work is based on the following provisions relevant for modern linguistic science:

1. At the level of a single artistic statement, several voices are manifested, identifiable with real or imaginary persons [13].
2. ‘Other’ is a necessary condition for the semiotisation of the personality and the regulator organizing its experience and behavior [29].
3. A language work is the key to numerous products of various processes of the individual processing their diverse experience of emotional interaction with the surrounding reality [30].
4. Emotions by their nature appear as a phenomenon of linguistic consciousness, and subjectively experiencing them serves as the main organizing factor of consciousness, the basis of selectivity in the aspect of speech activity, as well as the focus of the human mind [31].
5. Cohesion is a semantic concept directly related to the relationship of meanings found in the text, and defines the text as such [32].

Results

The analysis of 3375 contexts of free indirect speech (where various types of connecting tools are presented) revealed:

- Lexico-syntactic connectors are an effective means of creating linear continuity of free indirect speech;
- If the previous contextual situation represents free indirect speech, sentences containing lexico-syntactic connectors receive the same interpretation in the text, in other words, they imply the character's point of view;
- Lexico-syntactic connectors link not only the preceding and the subsequent discourse segment but also the different cognitive states of the character, which are actualized at the moment of narration;
- Lexico-syntactic connectors are tools for creating cohesion outside the sentence and discursive levels and for implementing the relevance of an utterance in accordance with the a priori actualized topic of dialogical

communication; besides, they act as a trigger for shifting from one point of view to another, facilitating the coordination of different points of view.

III. DISCUSSION

The underlying idea of the present research is the theory of S. Ehrlich, according to which lexico-syntactic connectors can be considered as a set of units that focus the readers attention on the fact that the sentence in which they are used is related to the expression of the point of view of the narrator or character. Cf.:

(1) *He was thinking of himself and the impression he was making, as she could tell by the sound of his voice, and his emphasis and his uneasiness. Success would be good for him. At any rate they were off again. Now she need not listen [27];*

«Он размышлял о себе, и о том впечатлении, которое он производил, как она смогла сказать, услышав его голос, расстановку акцентов в высказываниях, уловив его беспокойство. Успех пошел бы ему на пользу. В любом случае, они снова не проявились. Сейчас ей не нужно было слушать» (Вульф. В. На маяк);

(2) *“He thought, women are always like that; the vagueness of their minds is hopeless; it was a thing he had never been able to understand but so it was. It had been so with her – his wife. They could not keep anything clearly fixed in their minds. But he had been wrong to be angry with her; moreover, did he not rather like this vagueness in women? It was part of their extraordinary charm” [27];*

«Он думал, что женщины всегда так ведут себя; неопределенность их ума – безнадежна; этого он никогда не мог понять, но так оно и было. Так случилось и с ней – его женой. Они не могли ничего ясно друг другу объяснить. Но он был не прав, что сердится на нее; более того, разве ему не достаточно нравилась эта неопределенность в женщинах? Это было частью их необычного шарма» (Вульф В. На маяк).

In Passage (1), the first and second sentences can be viewed as an expression of the point of view of the female character. Use of Past Continuous *he was thinking/он размышлял* and *he was making/он производил (впечатление)* конструирует событие как увиденное глазами данного персонажа. Constructs an event as seen through the eyes of a given character. The use of the modal verb *could/ мог* and especially of the future in the past *would* also contributes to this understanding of the functional role of the sentences. While the third sentence is perceived, the expression *at any rate/в любом случае* connects this sentence with the two preceding ones, and the reader continues to interpret it from the standpoint of the character’s perspective already indicated.

In Example (2), the initial segment *He thought/подумал он* indicates that the thoughts of the character will be further expounded. The following sentences actualize the theme of the female character's reflections, therefore, they are interpreted by the reader as an expression of the character's point of view. However, the sentence *But he had been wrong to be angry with her/Но он был не прав, что сердится на нее* potentially switches the perspective. In this regard, it can be considered as an expression of the point of view of the narrator; therefore, we potentially face two possible interpretations: either the narrator expresses his judgments about the character and tells the reader that this character was wrong, or the character himself has changed his point of view.

In the examples above, the highlighted sentences are integrated into the previous flow of artistic discourse by means of lexico-syntactic connectors at *at any rate в любом случае, but/но*. It seems that since the preceding discourse is identified as free indirect speech, sentences containing lexico-syntactic connectors receive the same interpretation in the text, i.e. in terms of expressing a character's point of view. Connectors facilitate this interpretation.

Let us consider two more examples.

(3) *He had a high good time; **and yet**, when he remembered it, it seemed a pain. His mother was a cool with him for a day or two. **But** he was so adorable - ! **And yet** a tinge of loneliness was creeping in again, between her and him [25];*

*«У него было очень хорошее время; **и все же**, когда он вспоминал его, оно отзывалось болью. В течение двух-трех дней мать была с ним холодной. **Но** он был таким обворожительным! **И все же**, нотка одиночества снова давала о себе знать, в отношениях между нею и им» (Лоуренс Д.Г. Сыновья и любовники).*

(4) *“On the whole she scorned the male sex deeply. **But** here was a new specimen, quick, light, graceful, who could be gentle and who could be sad, **and** who was clever, **and** who knew a lot, **and** who had a death in the family... **Yet** she tried hard to scorn him, because he would not see in her the princess **but** only the swinegirl. **And** he scarcely observed her” [25].*

*«В целом она глубоко презирала мужской пол. **Но** здесь оказался новый экземпляр, подвижный, легкий, грациозный, который умел быть нежным и печальным, **и** который был умным, **и** который много знал, **и** в семье которого уже кто-то умер... **Но все же** она очень пыталась презирать его, потому что он не видел в ней принцессу, **а** только свиарку. **И** он едва заметил ее» (Лоуренс Д.Г. Сыновья и любовники).*

One of the main topics of contemporary artistic discourse – the illusiveness of the boundaries between such oppositions as ‘life and I’ and ‘I and Others’ – is directly reflected in the lexical and syntactic features of the author's narration. The special author's language of artistic narration is also embodied in the free indirect speech in Example (3). It can be assumed this example begins with a statement of Williams (Morel's eldest son) point of view, then William's mother, Mrs Morel, speaks. Perceiving Passage (3), the reader is not always able to tell with certainty whose point of view is presented. In particular, the last sentence could potentially express the point of view of either character.

Both passages abound with means of cohesion; in this regard, the following questions appear to be logical:

- What is the functional role of means of cohesion in free indirect speech?
- Is there a meaningful correlation between the frequency of means of cohesion, the problematic characters image in the textual expression of the point of view and the ambiguity of attributing this point of view to a particular character?

The means of cohesion we identified in Examples (3) and (4) do not imply the perspective of analysis S. Ehrlich suggested in the above-mentioned research model. In this regard, it is advisable to investigate the role of means of cohesion in Passages (3) and (4).

In Example (3), the first three sentences express Williams point of view: the combination *it seemed a pain/отзывалось болью* implies this character's interpretation of certain events; the combination *his mother/его мать* can also be attributed to this character in referential terms. We believe the fourth sentence can be regarded as an expression of Mrs Morel's attitude to the events, since only she can think that *he was plausible/он был убедительным*. At the same time, taking into account the connector *but/но* found in this statement leads to an alternative interpretation: in this case, it can be considered as a kind of William playing up with the thoughts of Mrs Morel.

In other words, analyzing the connector *but/но* can clarify the ambiguity of attributing the point of view (expressed by the given statement) to a particular character. This conjunction connects the thoughts of two characters, yet it most likely does not support the expression of one's point of view but interrupts it.

Similar questions arise in the analysis of Passage (4). In the sentences **But** *here was a new specimen, quick, light, graceful* and **Yet** *she tried hard to scorn him* the conjunctions that initiate statements support Miriam's thoughts and do not create the ambiguity inherent in the preceding example. The sentence **And** *he scarcely observed her* is also formally associated with the previous flow of discourse by the conjunction *and/и*.

As our observations show, at the level of free indirect speech, this conjunction not only manifests the connection of two consecutive statements, thus providing linear continuity of free indirect speech but also directly links the moment of silence of the character and his subsequent 'inner' statement. Cf.:

(5) *She looked in wonder for a few moments. And what does it stand for now? A magnificent second-lieutenant [25];*

«Некоторое мгновение она смотрела в изумлении. А что это сейчас значит? Великолепный второй лейтенант» (Лоуренс Д.Г. Мёртвая петля).

In this case, the conjunction *and/а* starts the character's inner speech. From the context of the narration, it becomes clear that the character's utterance is initiated after a moment of silence. In this regard, it can be concluded that the conjunction links the moment and the subsequent statement of the character in the framework of free indirect speech.

At the level of free indirect speech (as in the case of direct speech) the conjunction *and/и* is capable of linking not only the preceding and subsequent discourse segment but also the various cognitive states of the character that are actualized at the moment of the narration. Cf.:

(6) *"She stood watching as he sat bent forward in his stupefaction. The fine cloth of his uniform showed the moulding of his back. And something tortured her as she saw him, till she could hardly bear it..." [25];*

«Она стояла и наблюдала, как он сел, наклонившись вперед, в оцепенении. Прекрасная ткань его униформы запечатлела изгиб его спины. И что-то мучило ее в то время, пока она смотрела на него, до тех пор пока она не могла больше этого выносить...» (Лоуренс Д.Г. Мёртвая петля).

In the above example, at the level of free indirect speech, the conjunction *and/и а* in the initial position of the utterance manifests a change of the character's perceptual activity to mental activity. Cf. one more example:

(7) “*He bent down **and** kissed her. **And** still her clear, rather frightening eyes seemed to be searching for him inside himself*” [25];

«Он наклонился и поцеловал ее. А ее все еще ясные, очень испуганные глаза, казалось, искали его внутри его же» (Лоуренс Д.Г. Мёртвая петля).

In this case, the conjunction *and/u a* first records the transition of the physical activity of the character to interactive activity, then the transition from interactive to mental activity. The description of the action in the first sentence of Passage (7) can be logically supplemented only by the narrator.

The second sentence can be interpreted as the perception of a female character by a male character. In free indirect speech, textual evidence is found for such interpretation: the evaluative combination *rather frightening/очень напуганные*, the verb expressing uncertainty *seemed/казалось* and the reflexive pronoun *himself/его же*. Thus, in this passage, using the example of the conjunction *and* we see not only the expression of linking the character’s different states but also with the docking of both the narrators and various characters points of view on the events modeled in the text.

The use of connectors in the pragmatic function of the textual opposition of two characters points of view is even more explicit in the following example:

(8) *Ha! she cried suddenly. It wouldnt come to that, either. If they kick you out of the army, youll find somebody to get round youre like a cat, youll land on your feet. **But** this was just what he was not. He was not like a cat. His self-mistrust was too deep. Ultimately he had no belief in himself, as a separate isolated being. He knew he was sufficiently clever, an aristocrat, good-looking, the sensitive superior of most men. The trouble was, that apart from the social fabric he belonged to, he felt himself nothing, a cipher* [25];

«Ха!» – вдруг крикнула она. “Этим так все не окончится. Если они выкинули тебя из армии, ты все равно найдешь, с кем быть рядом – ты как кот, ты приземлишься на свои ноги”. **Но** котом он не был. Он не был похож на кота. Недоверие к себе глубоко коренилось в нем. В конце концов, он не верил в себя, будучи отдельно существующим человеком. Он знал, что он достаточно сообразителен, аристократ, привлекателен, более чувствительный, чем большинство мужчин. Беда была в том, что в стороне от социальной структуры, к которой он принадлежал, он чувствовал себя ничем, ничтожеством...» (Лоуренс Д.Г. Мёртвая петля).

The conjunction *but/no* connects the statement of the female character either with the point of view of the male character on himself or with the analysis of the true inner nature of the male character undertaken by the narrator. In the analyzed example, the conjunction *but/no* models not only the contrast between the various ideas important for an adequate understanding of the work but also contrasts the points of view expressed by the two voices presented in the narration.

It is interesting to note that the theoretical model of lexico-syntactic connectors by S. Ehrlich does not explain such situations. It seems that for the subsequent analysis of the pragmatic role of means of cohesion in the process of

expressing the narrators and the characters point of view on the simulated events within the framework of artistic discourse, it is advisable to refer to similar studies that were conducted on the basis of dialogical speech.

In particular, an alternative source of explanation for the interpretation of cohesive means in free indirect speech can be found in conversion analysis studies that address the problems of the coordinating function of conjunctions *and/u*, *but/но*, as well as adverbs *yet* and *still /все же* in the conjunction function. These studies analyze the aforementioned tools as discursive markers, an extensive set of units including the interjections *well/ну*, *oh/o* and phrases such as *you know/знаешь ли*, *you see/видишь ли*, *I mean/я имею в виду*. In the context of dialogical speech, these language units perform the same pragmatic function: they specifically organize spontaneous communication since their meaning (including the derivative) is not made only of lexical and grammatical components.

Thus, connectors *and/u* and *but/но* in the role of discursive markers retain their respective nuclear semantic meaning of adding information and constructing contrast, but they also acquire the pragmatic meaning of expressing continued and opposing actions in dialogue [7-11].

The following example illustrates this theoretical position:

(9) - **But** over here, we use that word so just like we use the word here irregardless, which there is no such word, right?

- *I just use it and every time I use it I know Im wrong.*
- *No but I use it. I-I-I irregardless*
- *You use it too?*
- *I use it.*
- **And** there is no such word.
- *I think there may have been a word like that at one point in time cause I use it all the time...*
- *No. There wasn't" (Brown C. The Hellbound Heart);*

«– ... Но здесь мы используем это слово таким образом... точно также как мы используем его и другим образом, как будто этого слова совсем нет, да?

- *... Я просто использую его, и я знаю, что каждый раз я использую его неправильно.*
- *Нет, но я использую его. Я-я-я- независимо...*
- *Ты также используешь его?*
- *Я пользуюсь им.*
- **Но** такого слова нет.
- *Я думаю, что такое слово может существовать в определенный момент времени, потому что я все время им пользуюсь...*
- *Нет. Его нет» (Баркер К. Восставший из ада).*

Explaining similar examples, D. Schiffrin points out that the speaker begins their dialogical utterance with the conjunction *and* not as a link between two statements but in the metalinguistic function of signaling that the subject of the conversation, which the addressee is trying to retreat from, is continued [Schiffrin , 1986: 59].

In this case, the speaker, while actualizing the conjunction union *and/u/a* in their dialogical statement, seems to have the following pragmatic goals:

- An indication to the interlocutor that the speaker has more reasons to back up their point of view;
- Clarification of the fact that this statement appears to be an appropriate dialogical step for the subsequent course of the dialogue.

The word *and/ u/ a* is thus used to mark the continuation of the speaker's dialogue.

In the example indicated above, the connector is found in the initial position of the dialogical utterance and is used to correlate opposing opinions belonging to two interlocutors in one time plane. A similar functional role of connectors is also found in Example (4) taken from a narrative artistic text. In example (4), the conjunction *and u* also connects points of view expressed by different characters.

The conjunction *but/но* which introduces contrast is also used in dialogical speech in the initial position of the speaker's utterance. Cf.:

(10) “ - ... *and then you could, concentrate on the specific areas. Then you could see more in depth where how things related. But I think you absolutely have to see, how where the relationships are.*

- *Yeah, but sometimes I get wondered whether its all related.*
- *But ultimately it is. Right. I mean everybody started out people who were in nineteen hundred, they did everything right?*
- *But thats then, thats not now, now*
- *But ultimately it they it so its all spread out now. But it all came from somewhere, right?*
- *Yeah, its like saying were all related [24];*

«- ... *и тогда ты смог бы, сконцентрируйся на особых зонах Тогда ты смог бы увидеть больше в глубине, как все соотносится друг с другом. Но я думаю, что ты должен увидеть, как и где протекают эти взаимоотношения.*

- *Да, но иногда удивляюсь, соотносится ли в действительности все это.*
- *Но, в конечном итоге, соотносится. Да. Я хочу сказать, что все стали искать среди тех, кто оказался в тысяча девятисотых годах, они все делали так, как нужно?*
- *Но это было тогда, сейчас это не актуально...*
- *Но именно актуально... Но все это откуда-то протекает, ведь так?*
- *Да, это все равно, что говорить о том, что мы все связаны между собой...» (Дейвис. Р. Мятёжные ангелы).*

Note that if this dialogue be transformed into a narrative text, the conjunction *but/но* disappears. Cf.:

(11) *By concentrating on the specific areas within anthropology one could see in greater depth how these areas were related to each other. Seeing these relationships is crucial. One might wonder about the extent to which the separate fields are in fact related. However, consider the generality of interests of the anthropologists of seventy years ago. While each specialty of today has its own focus, they all have their origin in that more general approach;*

«Концентрируясь на специфических зонах в рамках антропологии, можно увидеть на более глубинном уровне, как эти зоны соотносятся друг с другом. Важно увидеть эти взаимоотношения. Можно удивляться тому, до каких пределов отдельные области, фактически, соотносятся. Однако необходимо принять во внимание и общность интересов с антропологами, которые вели исследования семьдесят лет назад. Хотя каждая современная специальность фокусирует исследовательское внимание на отдельной проблеме, все эти специальности имеют в своей основе более общий подход».

A parallel can be drawn between the frequency of the conjunction *but/но* in the dialogical speech and the new dialogical move of the speaker. The pragmatic function of this conjunction with this research perspective is to:

- To model a contradiction, although not always complete;
- Add new information that changes the essence of communication – *not only that, but/не только, но и...*;
- A call to respect the sequence of dialogical utterances – *but wait a minute/но подождите минутку...*

The first function directly involves the traditional grammatical description of this connector as an adversative conjunction. The following two functions represent what D. Schiffrin called ‘contrasting actions’. In this regard, conjunctions *and/и* and *but/но* show similarity in their ability to establish cohesion outside the sentence and discursive levels, to maintain the relevance of the statement in accordance with the a priori actualized topic of dialogical communication. These observations of the functioning of connectors in dialogue clarify the use of the conjunction *but/но* in Example (8) where the conjunction realizes the shift from William's point of view to Mrs Morel's point of view.

Some researchers also point out that the relational function of discursive markers is to reconcile different points of view [33]. In particular, the relationship of concession is analyzed in connection with two dialogical positions, two opinions held by different interlocutors [12].

In dialogic communication, contrast and concession are initially associated with points of view shared by each of the interlocutors. The pragmatic function of discursive markers with the meaning of contrast and concession is to relate these points of view in one time plane and thus contribute to the linear organization of dialogic communication. In other words, connectors are meaningful precisely from an interactional point of view. Connectors act as a signal that the participant in the dialogue undertakes the obligation of co-constructing the expressed ideas, and they help recognize the opponents point of view.

Let us return to free indirect speech and try to trace the research effectiveness of the theoretical provisions of the conversion analysis in the textual presentation of the point of view of the narrator and the character. The above-mentioned dialogical paradigm of research turns out to be relevant.

To present the peculiarities of the interpretation of cohesive means in free indirect speech by translators of fiction, we used fragments of the translated D.H. Lawrences *Sons and Lovers* (translator E.I. Oblonskaya) where (in comparison with the original text) there is a modification of the punctuation features of the original statement with certain pragmatic goals.

The following examples show the struggle of Paul (*he/он*) and Miriam (*she/она*), the characters of the novel.

(12) “(a) ‘You make me so spiritual!’ he lamented. ‘And I don’t want to be spiritual.’ (b) She took her finger from her mouth with a little pop, and looked up at him almost challenging. (c) But still her soul was naked in her great dark eyes, and there was the same yearning appeal upon her. (d) If he could have kissed her in abstract purity he would have done so. (e) But he could not kiss her thus and she seemed to leave no other way. (f) And she yearned to him [25];

«(a) Ты меня так воодушевляешь! – сетовал он. – А я не хочу воодушевляться. (b) Она убрала палец от губ, слегка фыркнула и взглянула на него почти вызывающе. (c) Но все же в ее больших темных глазах виделась ее душа, как и та же тоска-призыв. (d) Если бы он мог поцеловать ее, как целуются дети, он бы сделал это. (e) Но он не мог так ее поцеловать – а она по-другому и не хотела. (f) И она тянулась к нему» (Лоуренс Д.Г. Сыновья и любовники).

After Paul’s direct speech, the reader is inclined to interpret Sentence (b) as a reflection of Paul’s perception of Miriam. Such interpretation strategy is supported, in particular, by the use of an evaluative lexeme *almost challenging/почти вызывающе*. Sentence (c) is interpreted as a continuation of the expression of Paul’s point of view: it contains markers indicating continuation of the action, *still/все же* and *but/но*. This sentence also uses the adjective *same/та же* which reflects a comparison of this subjective experience of perceiving an object with another experience that took place in the past, and it turns out that only the character himself, i.e. Paul, can understand this past experience.

Sentences (d) and (e) manifest an opportunity in the narrative world and hypothetically express a sense of restraint that prevents characters from kissing. Logically, these sentences reflect Paul’s thoughts. Seeing Sentence (f), the reader switches from the expression of Paul’s thoughts to an alternative interpretation of Miriam’s emotional state. While Paul believes that Miriam is highly spiritual and thus blocks his desire for physical intimacy, this segment of the text reveals Miriam’s desire for Paul (*yearning for him/ тянулась к нему*).

This sentence breaks the point of view established in the previous flow of the discourse. It states that Paul is not aware of Miriam’s desire and presents a contrast to what he thinks. This commentary appears to be something external to Paul’s mind and clearly belongs to another character or the narrator himself.

The connector turns Sentence (f) into a new point of view which is a peculiar reaction to Paul’s. Example (12) reveals two points of view which are docked by the connector as two remarks in lively dialogic communication. Moreover, the linked points of view are incompatible with each other. The connector signals their correlation and the author’s intention to present them as two sides of the same process – two views focusing on the same problem.

Cohesive means have a similar pragmatic function in the following example where the thoughts of two characters interact again.

(13) “(a) Miriam shuddered. (b) She drew him to her; she pressed him to her bosom; she kissed him and kissed him. (c) He submitted, but it was torture. (d) She could not kiss his agony. (e) That remained alone and apart. (f) She kissed his face, and roused his blood, while his soul was apart, writhing with the agony of death. (g) And she kissed him and fingered his body, till at last, feeling he would go mad, he got away from her. (h) It was not that he wanted just then not that. (i) And she thought she had soothed him and done him good [25];

«(a) Мириам вздрогнула. (b) Она притянула его к себе; она прижала его к своей груди; она целовала и целовала его. (c) Он поддался ее желанию, но это было пыткой. (d) Она не могла целовать его мучения. (e) Это чувствовалось во всем. (f) Она целовала его лицо и будоражила кровь в его венах, в то время как его душа была где-то далеко, извивалась в смертельной агонии. (g) И она поцеловала его и водила пальцем по его телу, пока, наконец, не почувствовала, что он сойдет с ума, он встал и отошел от нее. (h) Не этого он хотел тогда – не этого. (i) И она подумала, что успокоила его и сделала ему хорошо” (Лоуренс Д.Г. Сыновья и любовники).

It is obvious Sentence (h) expresses Paul’s dissatisfaction with the current situation, although the next sentence contains a counter-statement as a contrast revealing the experience of Miriam. Modeling these sentences as real dialogical utterances helps more clearly present the structure of free indirect speech.

Here, the conjunction *and* is initial in the dialogical utterance and introduces the expression of Miriam’s thoughts. However, in the literary text being analyzed, the conjunction initiates three simultaneous reactions to what is happening: the reactions of the narrator and of characters, Paul and Miriam.

In this aspect, it is interesting to trace the use of conjunctions as connectors in the original English text and in the Russian translation. Our observations indicate that the functioning of connectors in these texts does not always imply similar reader’s interpretation of free indirect speech.

Such discrepancy is due to the fact that discursive markers are characterized in free indirect speech as optional, and their removal does not have a significant effect on the propositional meaning of the utterance. A comparative analysis of cohesive means in the original text and in the translation reveals their constructive role both paragraphing and in determining the punctuation features.

In the analyzed examples, connectors that mark the transition to the consciousness of another character, as a rule, are found at the beginning of statements, sometimes of paragraphs. If the translator (E.I. Oblonskaya) modifies the punctuation features of the original utterance (for example, replacing a dot with a comma or a semicolon), this has a significant effect on the readers perception of the characters point of view. The translator in this case is guided either by the rules of textual coherence characteristic of the Russian language or by her own style of translation.

The translator thus emphasizes the importance of change for an adequate understanding of the text by the readers. The fact that, in the process of translation, the readers perception of the characters point of view can be radically altered with the help of minor changes, in turn, sheds light on the fact that the author herself uses connectors with a certain pragmatic goal.

In the following example, the translator replaces the full stop before the conjunction with a colon or comma. Cf.:

(14) «Скоро смятение в его душе улеглось, и он обо всем забыл. Но сейчас во мраке была с ним не Клара, то была просто женщина, страсть, что-то, что он любил, едва ли не боготворил. Но то была не Клара, и она ему покорилась. Из-за его неприкрытого голода, из-за неминуемости его любви, из-за какой-то слепой, жестокой, первобытной силы, овладевшей им, ужасен был для Клары этот час. Но она понимала, его душа заледенела, он пронзительно одинок, и как же прекрасно, что он к ней пришел; и совсем просто приняла

*она его, ведь этот его жгучий голод больше и ее и его самого, а душа ее остается. Пусть он от нее уйдет, все равно она утолит его голод, **потому что** любит его» (Лоуренс. Д. Сыновья и любовники).*

The original artistic text is as follows:

(15) “And soon the struggle went down, and he forgot. But then Clara was not there for him, only a woman, warm, sometimes he loved and almost worshipped, there in the dark. But it was not Clara. **And** she submitted to him. The naked hunger and inevitability of his loving for her, sometimes strong and blind and ruthless in its primitiveness, made the hour almost terrible to her. She knew how stark and alone he was. **And** she felt it was great, that he came to her. **And** she took him simply, because his need was bigger than her or him. **And** her soul was still within her. She did this for him in his need, even if he left her. **For** she loved him [25].

We believe that one of the significant results of the translator's changing the punctuation features of the original text is the different reader's interpretation of the segments ... *и она покорилась ему / And she submitted to him*. In translation, this segment is connected with the previous statement and thus ‘continues’ the expression of Paul’s point of view. The pronoun *она* serves as a means of reference to Clara, but from the point of view of Paul. In other words, the text segment ... *и она покорилась ему* can be seen as the male character’s view of the current situation, his opinion of this situation.

In the author's original text, this segment is an independent statement, and the pronoun *she* in this case directly expresses the author's perspective, serving as an indicator of the author's narration. The fact that Clara submitted to Paul is independent of the viewpoint of Paul himself, which is reinforced by the independence of the statement. The conjunction *and* acquires the pragmatic function of signaling that the statement it introduces appears to be the author's reaction to Paul's thoughts, expressed in the preceding flow of the text.

Another example:

(16) «Она готова была все ради него вынести, готова страдать ради него. Она положила руку ему на колено. Он взял ее руку и поцеловал; но ему стало не по себе. Как будто он отказывается от себя. Приносит себя в жертву ее непорочности, которую, пожалуй, ни во что не ставит. **Но** зачем страстно целовать ей руку, ведь это только оттолкнет ее, не оставит ничего, кроме боли. **И все-таки** он медленно привлек Мириам к себе и поцеловал» (Лоуренс Д. Сыновья и любовники).

The original artistic text is as follows:

(17) 1. “She felt she could bear anything for him, she would suffer for him. 2. She put her hand on his knee as he leaned forward in his chair. 3. He took it and kissed it. 4. **But** it hurt to do so. 5. He felt he was putting himself aside. 6. He sat there sacrificed to her purity, which felt more like a nullity. 7. How could he kiss her hand passionately, when it would drive her away, and leave nothing but pain? 8. Slowly he drew her to him and kissed her [25].

The connector *но*, introduced in the translation, indicates that the following statement continues to express Paul's point of view on the current situation. In the author's text, means of cohesion perform a different pragmatic role.

In particular, in the author's text, they mark the transition to new points of view. Statement (3) contains a description of the characters action and is perceived as a segment of the authors narration. Statement (4) introduces the author's opinion of the characters contrast point of view.

The connector *yet* between (7) and (8) actualizes the transition from Pauls thoughts to the authors narration about the actions of this character. In the text, there is a combination of the author's narrating the characters actions and the point of view of the character on the situation.

The pragmatic importance of this connector for rendering the author's intention is emphasized by the fact that it remains in the translation. Leaving it out could lead to a transformation of the meaning of the text. In particular, this connector testifies to the sensitivity of the author of the original text to the technical aspects of modeling free indirect speech.

IV. RESULTS

Analysis of the contextual situations presented in the study allows concluding that manipulating the means of cohesion while translating can significantly affect the reader's perception of the characters' points of view and of the author's narration. The translation in this case reveals the translators desire to deepen the inner conflict of the character or the conflict between different characters and the author. At the same time, the translation transformation of the authors use of connectors aims at making the psychological portrait of the character more accessible to the readers perception.

Such translation strategy is accompanied by a displacement of the boundaries between the points of view of the character and the author expressed in the text, and presents these points of view in the form of a dialogue of consciousnesses that were actualized in the text modeling process. In other words, in free indirect speech not only the voice of the character but also of the author begins to sound. Means of cohesion appear as markers of free indirect speech and establish a pragmatic relationship not only between statements that manifest the point of view of a particular character but also between opinions belonging to different characters and to the author.

REFERENCES

- [1] Omelkina, O.V. Free indirect speech as a linguistic and pragmatic category: on the material of German prose: PhD thesis. Samara, 2007. - 21 p.
- [2] Sysoeva, V.V. The narrative potential of free indirect speech in a literary text: PhD thesis. Belgorod, 2004. - 20 p.
- [3] Sharapova, Yu.V. Free indirect speech in the functional-communicative and structural-semantic aspects: on the material of the English language: PhD thesis. SPb., 2001. - 22 p.
- [4] Trufanova, I.V. Pragmatics of free indirect speech: PhD thesis. Nizhny Novgorod, 2001. - 46 p.
- [5] Halliday, M., Hasan, R. Coherence in English [Text] / M. Halliday, R. Hasan. London: Longman, 1976. 321 p.
- [6] Reinhart, T. Conditions for Text Coherence [Text] / T. Reinhart // Poetics Today. – 1980. – № 1. – PP. 161-180.
- [7] Borodnikov, P.A. Markers of reasoning in everyday discourse: PhD thesis. Ivanovo, 2009. - 22 p.
- [8] Gelpey, E.A. The constructive role of frames of pragmatic connectivity of utterances in dialogical speech (on the material of the English language): PhD thesis. Rostov-on-Don, 2007. - 21 p.
- [9] Kamensky, M.V. Sociolinguistic paradigm of discourse markers: on the material of the English language: PhD thesis. Stavropol, 2007. - 21 p.

- [10] Kotov, E.A. Sociocommunicative features of the functioning of discursive markers. *NCFU Collection of scientific papers*. - 2003. - Vol. 10. - p. 27-33.
- [11] Pigrova, E.K. Metacommunicative markers in spontaneous oral speech: PhD thesis. - SPb., 2001. - 21 p.
- [12] Couper-Kuhlen, E., Thompson, S. Concessive Patterns in Conversation [Text] / E. Couper-Kuhlen, S. Thompson // Cause Condition Concession Contrast Cognitive and Discourse Perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. PP. 381-410.
- [13] M.M. Bakhtin [Bakhtin, 1975, 1979, 2002]
- [14] Bogin [Bogin, 1982, 1986, 1989, 1993]
- [15] I.R. Galperin [Galperin, 1981]
- [16] G.G. Infantova [Infantova, 1958, 1962]
- [17] O.I. Moskalskaya [Moskalskaya, 1978]
- [18] Yu.A. Sorokin [Sorokin, 1982]
- [19] Z.Ya. Turaeva [Turaeva, 1994]
- [20] V.V. Krasnykh [Krasnykh, 2011, 2012]
- [21] P. Werth [Werth, 1999],
- [22] M. Fludernik [Fludernik, 1996]
- [23] Barker, C. *The Hellbound Heart*. L.: Vintage, 2002. 254 p.
- [24] Davies, R. *The Rebel Angels*. L.: Penguin, 2002. 397p.
- [25] Lawrence, D.H. *Sons and Lovers*. L.: Penguin, 2002. 314 p.
- [26] Woolf, V. *Mrs. Dalloway*. Penguin, 1999. 213 p.
- [27] Woolf, V. *To the Lighthouse*. Penguin, 2003. 321 p.
- [28] Ehrlich, Susan. *Point of view: A linguistic analysis of literary style*. *Routledge*, 1990.
- [29] Lakan Z. *Instantiia bukvy v bessoz-natel'nom, ili Sud'ba razuma posle Freida*. M.: Logos. 1997.
- [30] Zalevskaya AA. Psycholinguistic approach to the concept. Methodical problems of cognitive linguistics.– Voronezh: *Publishing house of Voronezh University*. 2001:154-73.
- [31] Zhelvis VI. Emotivnyi aspekt rechi. Psikholingvisticheskaya interpretatsiya rechevogo vozdeistviya [The emotive aspect of speech. Psycholinguistic interpretation of speech influence]. Yaroslavl': YaGPI. 1990.
- [32] Borisenko AI, Volokobinskij YM, Kokovina VN, Troshina EP, Chepik LF, Frolova TN. Rare-earth doping of silicon from silica films. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*. 1982; 262(6):1409-12.
- [33] Kiseleva I, Navrotsky A, Belitsky IA, Fursenko BA. Thermochemistry and phase equilibria in calcium zeolites. *American Mineralogist*. 1996 May 1; 81(5-6):658-67.