

- Сергиевский М. В. История французского языка. М. : Изд-во литературы на иностранных языках, 1947. 279 с.
- Скибина В. И. Национально неомогенный язык и лексикографическая практика. Запорожье : Видавель, 1999. 176 с.
- Степанов Г. В. Испанский язык в странах Латинской Америки. М. : Изд-во лит-ры на иностранных языках, 1963. 201 с.
- Степанов Г. В. Типология языковых состояний и ситуаций в странах романской речи. М. : Наука, 1976. 326 с.
- Чередниченко А.И. Язык и общество в развивающихся странах Африки. Киев : Изд-во при Киев. ун-те, 1983. 165 с.
- Швейцер А. Д. К вопросу о типологии национальных вариантов языка. *Типология сходств и различий близкородственных языков*. Кишинев : Штиинца, 1976. С. 21-30.
- Швейцер А. Д. Очерк современного английского языка в США. М. : Высшая школа, 1963. 215 с.
- Швейцер А.Д. История американского варианта английского языка: дискуссионные проблемы. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1995. № 3. С.77-91.
- Швейцер А.Д. Литературный английский язык в США и Англии. М. : Высшая школа. 1971. 200 с.
- Швейцер А.Д. Различия в лексике американского и британского вариантов современного литературного английского языка. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1967. №2. С. 65-72.
- Allsopp R., Allsopp J. (Eds.). *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1996. 697 p.
- Barber K. (Ed.). *The Canadian Oxford Dictionary*. Oxford, NY : Oxford University Press, 2001. 1710 p.
- Bell A., Kuiper K. (Eds.). *New Zealand English*. Wellington : Victoria University Press, 2000. 366 p.
- Bell A., Holmes J. (Eds.). *New Zealand Ways of Speaking English*. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters, 1990. 305 p.
- Clyne M. (ed.). *Pluricentric Languages : Differing Norms in Different Nations*. Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 2012. 487 p.
- Coseriu, Eug. Los conceptos de 'dialecto', 'nivel' y 'estilo de lengua' y el sentido propio la dialectología. *Linguística española actual*. 1981. #3. P. 1-32.
- Gadet, F. La variation plus qu'une écumen. *F. Gaudet. Langue française*. 1997. #115. P. 5-118.
- Graddol D. English, history diversity and Change . D. Graddol, D. Leith, J. Swann. L., NY : Routledge, 2003. 394 p.
- Hellinger M., Bußmann H. (Eds.). *Gender Across Languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*. Amsterdam, N.Y. : John Benjamins Publishing, 2001. 329 p.
- Hernández-Campoy J. M, Conde-Silvestre J. C. (Eds.). *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Chichester : John Wiley & Sons, 2012. 704 p.
- Ho-Abdullah I. Variety and Variability: A Corpus-based Cognitive Lexical-semantics Analysis of Prepositional Usage in British, New Zealand and Malaysian English Bern, Berlin : Peter Lang, 2010. 275 p.
- Hughes J. (Ed.). *The Concise Australian National Dictionary*. Melbourne : Oxford University Press, 1992. 662 p.
- Jenkins J. *Global Englishes : A resource book for students*. N.Y. : Routledge, 2015. 280 p.
- Lerer S. *Inventing English: A Portable History of the Language*. Columbia University Press, 2007. 320 p.
- Orsman H. W. (Ed.). *The Dictionary of New Zealand English / A Dictionary of New Zealandisms on Historical Principles*. Auckland : Oxford University Press, 1997. 965 p.
- Silva P. et al. (Eds.). *A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles*. Oxford, etc. : Oxford University Press, 1996. 825 p.

(Матеріал надійшов до редакції 3.05.18. Прийнято до друку 12.05.18)

УДК: 811.111'

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-1135/2018-73-13>

MYKHAYLENKO V.

(Institute of International Relations and Social Studies, MAUP, Kyiv)

THE INDEFINABLE IS DEFINABLE IN DISCOURSE

When we analyze the part of speech paradigm the position of interjection is peripheral therefore the authors consider interjections to be to be "loosely integrated into the linguistic system." We are particularly interested in the functional characteristic of interjections used by different speakers (various age, gender, education and profession), their distribution and pragmatics in all kinds of contexts reflected in the professional and non-professional discourse in John Grisham's novel "The Client," which is a perfect specimen of the 'occupational' or 'job' literature conveying the discourse of "legalese" in fiction style, and such symbiosis maybe labeled as 'paraprofessional discourse.' Then we will contribute one more point of view on the definition of interjections because Ulrice Stange says there is still no consensus how to define and categorize interjections because it is difficult to pinpoint what an interjection is [Stange, 2016].

By professional discourse we understand the legal discourse of policeman's, detective's, lawyer's, judge's, attorney's and doctor's described in the novel; by para-professional discourse we understand multimodal communication of attorneys, judges, lawyers with medics, kids, relatives and other occasional characters occurring in a professional and non-professional context of the occupational novel "The Client" by John Grisham.

Discussions of the interjections go back to ancient times and help reveal some fundamental issues of linguistics: form, meaning, and function. The units under study belong to a part of speech of interjections, their form is unchangeable, though in some cases we can come across such cases as *huh –uh* or *hey – ey* and the like. They express a variety of emotions, and syntactically they are parts of a sentence, or a separate sentences and there is a semantic correlation between interjections and the given structural units. Additionally, they play several discourse functions and point out discourse fluency or disfluency.

Despite a range of definitions their role in the contentive and structural character of discourse is significant, they provide the hearer/reader some information about the speaker's state, age, gender, education, profession, social status, and his/her attitude to the interlocutor and the situation. And mainly in discourse we can differentiate them into speaker-oriented and addressee oriented units.

Key words: interjection, discourse addressee-oriented, speaker-oriented, valency, discourse coherence

Михайленко В. В. Визначення невизначеного у структурі дискурсу. При аналізі частиномовної парадигми вигуку відрізняють його периферійну позицію, тому автори вважають, що вони мають бути "вільно інтегрованими у мовну систему". Нас особливо цікавить функціональна характеристика вигуків, що використовуються різними мовцями (різні за віком, статтю, освітою та професією), їх класифікація та прагматика у всіх контекстах, що відображені у професійному та непрофесійному дискурсі в романі Джона Грішама "Клієнт", який є ідеальним зразком "професійного" або "робочого" роману, що зображує дискурс юристів у художньому стилі. Такий симбіоз може бути позначений як "пара-професійний дискурс". Ми також додамо свою точку зору щодо визначення вигуків, оскільки Улріка Стендж (2016) зауважує, що досі немає консенсусу у визначенні та класифікації, тому що вирізнити, що є вигук, дуже важко.

Під професійним дискурсом ми розуміємо юридичний дискурс -- поліції, детективів, адвокатів, прокурорів, суддів, описаних у романі. Під пара-професійним дискурсом ми розуміємо мовлення адвокатів та їхніх клієнтів, юристів та медиків, дітей, родичів та інших персонажів роману.

Дискусії сягають античних часів, проте, допомагають розкрити деякі фундаментальні проблеми сучасного мовознавства: форми, значення та функції. Вигуки, які досліджуємо, належать до частини мови, мають незмінну форму, хоча в деяких випадках ми можемо зустріти такі випадки, як *Huh—Uh* або *Heu -- eu*. Вони виражають різні емоції, і синтаксично вони – складові речення або окремі речення та мають семантичну кореляцію з даними конструктами. Крім того, вони виконують декілька функцій у дискурсі та вказують на його континуум або дисконтинуум.

Незважаючи на різноманітні визначення, їх роль у змістовній та структурній площинах дискурсу значна, вони надають слухачеві / читачу певну інформацію про стан, вік, стат, освіту, професію, соціальний статус мовця а також його ставлення до співрозмовника й ситуації. В основному вигуки, що функціонують у дискурсі, можна поділити на групу, яка зорієнтована на мовця та групу, яка зорієнтована на адресат.

Ключові слова: вигук, дискурс, спрямований на адресат, спрямований на мовця, когерентність дискурсу.

PRELIMINARIES.

A traditional definition of interjections says that words such as *ugh!*, *gosh!*, *wow!* are often regarded as one of the parts of speech indicating an emotional state or attitude such as delight, surprise, shock, and disgust, but which has no referential meaning [Longman 2002, p.268]. As for their referential meaning they refer to the state of the speaker in a certain communicative situation or context as it is mentioned in the definition.

And another comment, interjections may belong to the semantic domain of “Exclamation,” which can a micro-domain of the Functional-Semantic Domain of “Exclamation,” consisting of units of various structures and representing various language levels. D. Crystal specifies their brief form, part of speech status and suggests that they are used most often as exclamations or parts of an exclamation [Crystal 2011, p. 200]. Syntactically, it is not related either to a sentence, or to its parts, but the corpus analysis proves that most of them are used in the sentence structure and they semantically related with the sentence, one cannot find an example of semantic non-correspondence between an interjection and a sentence, but for the stylistic purpose.

We must admit that in the discourse structure the interjection semantically correlates with an accompanying sentence. In Cuenca’s opinion interjections constitute a “peculiar grammatical class” sometimes referred to as «those little words, or ‘non-words’ whose main characteristic is being (phonologically and morphologically) anomalous [Cuenca 2001, p. 29].

Els Elffers admits that the traditional view of interjections, defined from ancient times onwards, is that they express the speaker’s feelings or emotions. It was incorporated in the earliest grammars of Western European languages and stayed in the grammars that followed [Elffers 2008, p.18]. As it turns out, however, this view adequately characterizes only a small subcategory of interjections. When we analyze the part of speech paradigm the position of interjection is peripheral therefore the authors consider interjections to be to be «loosely integrated into the linguistic system.”

We are particularly interested in the functional characteristic of interjections used by different speakers (of various age, gender, education and profession), their distribution and pragmatics in all kinds of contexts reflected in the professional and non-professional discourse in John Grisham’s novel “The Client,” which is a perfect specimen of the ‘occupational’ or ‘job’ literature conveying the discourse of “legalese” in fiction style, and such symbiosis maybe labeled as ‘para-professional discourse.’

Then we will contribute one more point of view on the definition of interjections because Ulrice Stange says there is still no consensus how to define and categorize interjections because it is difficult to pinpoint what an interjection is [Stange 2016, p.5]. By professional discourse we understand the legal discourse of policeman’s, detective’s, lawyer’s, judge’s, and attorney’s

described in the novel; by para-professional discourse we understand multimodal communication of attorneys, judges, lawyers and their communication with medicals, kids, relatives and other occasional characters occurring in a professional and non-professional context of the occupational novel "The Client" by John Grisham.

DISCUSSION: THEORETICAL FUNDAMENTALS.

Those remarks are quite representative of the 'state of art' about interjections and illustrate why «this class of items has eluded description. At this point, the question arises if interjections are indefinable at all? There is a contradiction in the definition of interjections, on the one hand, their number is limited, though, on the other hand, they are number is growing due to the conversion in certain distribution, for instance, *well* adv. → *well* intr. or multifunctional character due the speaker's intentional meaning, for instance, *Good Lord!*, *Goodness gracious!* Accordingly, there is an unclear boundary between the original item and other exclamatory utterances, where some referential meaning may be involved.

David P. Wilkins gives an expanded definition of interjection starting with the a lexical level: conventional lexical form, then comes to the syntactic (sentence) level: which (commonly and) conventionally constitutes an utterance on its own, goes on the distribution of the interjection: (typically) does not enter into construction with other word classes, is (usually) monomorphemic, and finishes with its morphology: (generally) does not host inflectional or derivational morphemes [Wilkins 1992, p.124].

It turns out that emotionally charged lexemes (*Boy! Man! Devil!*), phrases (*Good grief! Holy cow!*), or sentences (*God forbid! Bless you!*) cannot be included into the paradigm of interjections. And in my opinion it is quite correct because an exclamation is a general term referring to "utterances, which may not have the structure of a full sentence, and which shows strong emotion (*Good God!* or *Damn!*)" or "utterances which show the speaker's or writer's feelings. Exclamations begin with a phrase using what or how but they do not reverse the order of the subject and the auxiliary verb (*How clever she is! What a good dog!*) [Longman 2002, p.190].

By his criteria, the given exclamations such as are not interjections, but units like *eh, hmm, yeah, aha oh, ay, well, wow* and others. Several alternative ways of analyzing these items have been suggested, using such notions as minor sentence, formulaic language, etc. [Crystal 2011, p.239]. D. C. O'Connell and S. Kowal differentiate between three data sets of primary and secondary interjections in the text of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*":

(1) the original interjections written in the text;

(2) the interjections read aloud in commercial recordings by six professional readers of the entire text of the novel;

(3) the interjections spoken by actresses and actors in the film production.

Overall, the respective frequencies of occurrence of interjections were 136 (mostly used by two women characters):141(an average across six readers):398 (the actors and actresses added the major part of primary interjections) [O'Connell, Kowal 2010, p.153fl.]. The analysis proves the fact that interjection is indeed the purest verbal implementation of conceptual orality.

A psycholinguistic hypothesis regarding the use of interjections in spoken utterances, originally formulated by Ameka [Ameka 1992, 1994] for the English language was tested by O'Connell and S. Kowal [O'Connell, Kowal 2005, p. 253fl.]. The local syntactic isolation of interjections is paralleled by their articulatory isolation in spoken utterances i.e., by their occurrence between a preceding and a following pause. But the linguistic hypothesis that pauses both precede and follow interjections proved to be empirically groundless. A large percentage (96%) of the interjections in the film performance served the function of initializing various units of discourse, either after a pause before articulatory phrases, or before a sentence and/or turn.

Both the emotional and initiating functions of interjections are characteristic of conceptual and medial orality rather than of conceptual and medial literacy, that emphasizes their spontaneous feature [Ameka 1992, p. 101-118]. Andreas Jucker writes that in Jane Austin's early prose interjections are used in various ways for various purposes, they have a peak marking function, a

fore grounding function, and to a lesser extent, a turn-taking function, and serve as a mechanism for increasing the reader's emotional involvement. [Jucker 1992, p.63-66]

There are four main hypotheses on the nature of interjections:

- (i) They are not grammatical nor even linguistic items;
- (ii) Their grouping overlap with other categories (adverbs or particles);
- (iii) They are sentences or sentence-equivalents recognizes the sentences (sentence equivalents) can be represented by interjections];
- (iv) They constitute a separate grammatical category of unproductive words [Cuenca 2002, p.30; see also Libert 2011, p.282; Mykhaylenko 2016, p.232, 349].

METHODS. CORPUS. RESEARCH.

There is a discrepancy between the description of interjections in the language system and language in use, see the terms introduced by scholars: interjections; filler words; pause-fillers, discourse particles, discourse markers; sentence openers and closers; particles; weasel words; verbal pauses; and even parasite words – these nominations prove the absence a common theory of interjections and the levels of their research vary greatly. Anna Wierzbicka adds her observation: in most of these definitions is the fuzziness involved [Wierzbicka 1992, p152-153]. D. Crystal speaks of an 'unclear boundary' [Crystal 2011], Matthews calls interjections as an 'indeterminate category' and Wilkins uses the words 'commonly', 'typically' [Wilkins, 1992], etc.

R. A. Libert says that he differentiates the primary interjections according to their combinability either with the speaker or with the addressee. The author applies the term *valence* in a pragmatic/conversational sense to interlocutors and calls it call *conversational valence*. He proposes his definition of Conversational Valence as a linguistic item (word, phrase or sentence) referring either to the addressor or the addressee "both must be present in order for the utterance of it to be pragmatically well-formed" [Libert 2011, p.286]. We partially share Libert's opinion but we call primary interjections as addressor- or addressee-oriented.

1. In some cases, the phrases are used to signal that the addressor is about to say something and that the addressee listening should not interrupt, or that the addressor is going to say something s/he wants to emphasize:

1.1. [Attorney → Colleagues] "*Well, the statute is very broad, and I think it's a terrible flaw in the law*".

1.2. [Boss → his assistants] "*What about the note?*" Foltrigg asked, looking out the window. "*Well, it could be interesting.*"

1.3. [Boss – Assistants] "*I know all this.*" "*Right. Well, I was just thinking.*"

2. The interjections commonly used in the opening position of a turn, for instance, in the following contexts the interjection *well* the components of a communication opener and hesitation:

2.1. [Mark → Mother] "*Well, me and Ricky were back in the woods playing this afternoon. Well, we ran home, and he fell on the couch and started sucking his thumb and wouldn't talk.*"

2.2. [Policeman → Mark] "*Well, I think you kids were in the woods smoking.*"

In these contexts *well* is the speaker-oriented, see also:

2.3. [Mark → Detectives] "*Well, we can wait a day or two until she's available, Mark offered*".

The speaker tries to postpone a talk with investigators. He does not want to be alone because he knows his right of a child, besides, once has already had a negative experience.

2.4. [Detective → Mark] "*Well, we just, you know, want to ask you some questions about yesterday.*"

The speaker tries to persuade Mark into talking because he needs to find the truth, though he understands that is illegal. However in both cases *well* reveals the component of a pause filler and the component of a search of the way out of that situation

2.5. [Reggie → Mark] "*Well, Mark, I'm afraid I have some bad news.*"

Well is used as an opener and as a pause filler showing that the speaker is feeling for words, see also the initial *uh*:

2.6. [Lawyer → Judge] *“Uh, Your Honor, -would it be possible for gentlemen to remain in the-“*

3. Here are some illustrations of *Yeah* in the function of the topic change and in the function of the communicative role change retaining the semantic component of agreement and developing the component of supporting a dialogue.

3.1. [Secretary → Mark] *“Yeah. It's confidential, you know?”*

3.2. [Mark → Secretary] *“Yeah, I know. “In there with Reggie?”*

3.3. [The secretary → Mark] *“Yeah.”*

3.4. [Mark → Secretary] *“Yeah. He represented my mother in her divorce a couple of years ago.”*

3.5. [Mark → Secretary] *“Yeah. My ex-father thought he should get one kid.”*

3.6. The Secretary → Mark) *“But you testified.”* [Mark → Secretary] *“Yeah, for three hours.”*

3.7. [The Secretary → Mark] *And it worked?”* [Mark → the Secretary] *“Yeah. My father wanted some visitation rights...”*

3.8. [Secretary → Mark] *“And he tried to get custody?”* [Mark → Secretary] *“Yeah. He lied in court, and he was doing a pretty good job of it.”*

As for the communicative valence of *Yeah* it is bi-valent – it helps the speaker to continue communication and at the same time stimulates the addressee to continue the dialogue. It is also used as a response to the question or a point of view by the boy. But the secretary also employs other linking elements, for instance, the unit *so* is used by the secretary (3.11.), conjunctions *and* (3.7., 3.8.), *but* (3.6, 3.12.) or the conjunction *and* + an interrogative sentence (3.12).

However, the communicative models reveal that *Yeah* is a regular unit in American English: it may be used by speakers of different age (a boy of eleven, a young secretary, a middle-aged detective), gender and social status.

Of course, the highest frequency of *Yeah* characterizes the children and youngsters. Nevertheless in the military formula “Yes, sir!” the unit of agreement or obedience *yes* is registered (see 2 cases in Mark’s discourse):

3.9. [Mark → Policeman] *“He wanted to lie, but at the moment he doubted a lie would work.”* “Uh, yes sir.”

3.10. [Lawyer → Judge] *Yes sir, and we know that this child is impeding an investigation.*

3.11. [Secretary → Mark] *“So you've been through a divorce, and then a bankruptcy?”* [Mark → Secretary] *“Yeah. The bankruptcy lawyer was a real bozo too.”*

3.12. [Secretary → Mark] *“But you like Reggie?”* [Mark → the Secretary] *“Yeah. Reggie's cool.”*

3.13. [Detective → Colleagues] *“Yeah, he's in contempt, but we can't predict what the judge will do at that point”.*

3.14. [Detective → Colleagues] *“Yeah, a lot of stuff to cover, -- he said, exhausted, waving his hand proudly at the piles of books and notes.”*

3.15. [Mark → Reggie] *“Yeah, me too. So much for pleasant dreams, huh.”*

3.16. [Policema → Mark] *“So what happened to your face?”* Hardy asked, *chomping away.”*

3.17. [Ricky → Mark] *“Yeah, let's get the hell outta here.”*

The unit *so* is also used by a policeman (3.15.) and Mark (3.14.) as well. It proves the fact that the use of *so* is not limited either by an age group, or an educational status. The difference lies in its frequency as an interjection.. It is also once registered as adverb in Mark’s speech:

3.18. [Dr Greenway → Mark] *“Do you remember smoking a cigarette?”* [Mark → Dr Greenway] *“I think so.”*

4. The discourse may be crammed with fillers to show the speaker’s rumination, for instance:

4.1. [Detective → Colleague] *“Look, Roy, --Trumann said with hesitation, --you need to be careful with this gal. She might be taping this.”* (--What makes you think so?) *“Well, uh, you just never...”*

5. The interjection *Hey* is mainly used to draw the addressee's attention

5.1. [Policeman → Colleagues]: *Hey, fellas, this is Mark Sway, the kid who made the call, Hardy announced.*"

5.2. [Mark→Ricky] "*Hey, Ricky, wait, but it didn't work.*"

6. It is not uncommon for people to use filler phrases such as *like, so, and you know*, but it becomes a problem when the phrases are overused to the point of distraction.

6.1. [Lawyer → Judge] "*Well, uh, Your Honor, we, uh, can prove our allegations if given the chance. We, uh, believe what we've said in the petition.*"

In the first case *well* as an opener and is bi-valent or the addressee-oriented but then *Uh* is used as a sigh of the speaker's embarrassment and it is mono-valent or a speaker-oriented.

6.2. [Reggie → C.E.O.] "*Who's your attorney?*" [C.E.O. → Reggie] "*Uh, jeez, uh, Findley and Baker.*"

As for impoliteness the interjection *Hey* is not proper in the Mark's address to the grown-up policeman:

7.1. [Mark→ Policemen who arrested him] "*Hey, meathead.*"

7.2. [Mark→ Policemen who arrested him] "*Hey, you clowns up there.*"

The interjection in combination with the negatively-charged vocative can express a negative component but beyond it is quite regular unit to draw someone's attention.

8. The interjection *uh* in the middle of the character's speech or within is used to as a pause filler to feel for words..

8.1. [Lawyer → Judge] "*We, uh, believe what we've said in the petition.*"

8.2. [Mark → Secretary] "*I, uh, I don't have an injury.*"

Uh is the addressor-oriented. [Secretary→ Mark] "*Well, you're in the wrong place.*"

Well is the addressee-oriented.

The corpus analysis of the novel (Chapters 1-20) reveals that the interjection *Well* has the highest frequency in the text – 22, most units are parts of the sentence in the initial position, but one following the interjection *Yeah*. The interjection *Yeah* has the frequency of 17 (9 in the sentence structure and 8 as independent sentences). The interjection *Uh* has the frequency of 12 (8 in the middle position signaling a pause and 4 in the initial) and its variants *Huh* is registered thrice in the final position signaling the end of communication and *Uhu* used 4 times in the final position too. The interjection *Hey* is used 7 times in the initial position and followed as a rule by direct address. The interjection *Oh* is used in the initial position of the contexts revealing either surprise (4 cases), or negation (3 cases) supported by negative pronouns *no, nothing*), or once as recollection plus the imperative sentence.

Though Els Elffer writes that "interjections, unlike "normal" words, do not enter into relationships with other words" [Elffer 2008, p.18fl.] because they do not form parts of the sentence but the discourse analysis reveals that they are used as a constituent of a sentence or a separate sentence.

The distributional analysis of interjections in the sentence structure shows that there is a semantic correlation between the interjection and a part of the sentence which follows it, for instance:

"Well" + "uh" = "drawing the addressee's attention" + "pause filler";

"Hey" + "Vocative" = "emphasizing "address";

"Well" + "Vocative" = "drawing the addressee's attention" + "Address";

"Well" + "I think" = "drawing the attention of the addressee" + "modal phrase";

"Yeah" + "well" = "agreement" + "drawing the attention of the addressee";

"Oh" + "really" = "surprise" + "intensifier";

"Ah" + "yes" = "recollecting" + "affirmation";

"Uh" + "jeez" = "pause" + "exclamation."

In formal written style of the the discourse not used which depersonalize some types of written discourse [see Corture 1992, p.21].

CONCLUSION. PERSPECTIVES.

Discussions on the interjections come back from antique and help reveal some fundamental issues of linguistics: form, meaning, and function. The units under study belong to a part of speech of interjections, their form is unchangeable, though in some cases we can come across such cases as *huh –uh* or *hey – ey* and the like.

They express a variety of emotions, and syntactically they are parts of a sentence, or a separate sentence and there is a semantic correlation between interjection and the given structural unit. Additionally, they play several discourse functions and point out discourse fluency or disfluency.

Despite a range of definitions their role in the contentive and structural character of discourse is significant, they provide the hearer/reader some information about the speaker's state, age, gender, education, profession, social status, and his/her attitude to the interlocutor and the situation. And mainly in discourse we can differentiate them into speaker-oriented and addressee oriented units. A tentative analysis of formal written style of the novel and other documents prove the absence of interjections referring them mainly to the oral style. Besides in the process of interpretation the interjections must be verbalized to retain the speaker's intention meaning that requires an elaboration of interjection interpreting algorithm.

Literature

- Bhatia Vijay K., Garzone Giuliana, Salvi Rita (eds.). *Language and Law in Professional Discourse: Issues and : and perspectives* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. P.172.
 Fraser B (1999) What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1999. Vol. 31(7): 931–952.
 Furkó B.P. *The Pragmatic Marker -Discourse Marker Dichotomy Reconsidered: The Case of 'Well' and 'Of Course'*. Debrecen, Hungary: Debrecen University Press, 2007.
 Groot Albert W. de. Structural linguistics and word classes. *Lingua*. 1948. Vol.1. P. 427-500.
 Klyoster Anna. The Fragmentation of Professional Discourse. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2015. Vol.206. P. 56-61.
 Lewis D. Discourse markers in English: A Discourse-pragmatic view. /Ed. K.Fischer. *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier, 2006. P. 43–59.

References

- Ameka F. Interjections : The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*.1992. Vol. 18 (2-3). P. 101-118.
 Corture Barbara. Categorizing professional discourse: Engineering, administrative, and technical/professional writing. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*. 1992. Vol. 6 (1). P. 5–37.
 Cruz M. P. Might interjections encode concepts? More questions than answers. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. 2009. Vol. 5(2). P.241-270.
 Crystal David. *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2011. 560 p.
 Cuenca Maria Joseph. Defining the indefinable? Interjections. *Syntaxis*. 2000. Vol.3. P. 29-44.
 Elffers Els. Interjections and the Language Functions Debate. *Henry Sweet Society Bulletin*. 2008. Vol.50. P. 8-29.
 Graffi Giorgio. *200 years of syntax: A critical survey*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2001. 551p.
 Jovanović V.Z. The form, position, and meaning of interjections in English. *Facta Universitatis: Series Language and Literature*. 2004. Vol. 3(1). P.17-28.
 Jucker Andreas. *English historical pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013. 236p.
 Kowal Sabine, O'Connell Daniel C. *Communicating with one another: Toward a psychology of spontaneous spoken discourse*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media, 2009. 265p
 Libert Reed Alan. *On conversational valence and the definition of interjections*. / Ed. M. Ponsonnet, L. Dao, M. Bowler. Proceedings of the 42nd Australian Linguistic Society Conference. 2011. P.281-295.
 Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. / Ed. Jack C. Richards and Richard Schmidt. London : Prarson, 2002. 595p.
 Mykhaylenko V. V. *A Glossary of linguistics and translation studies : English-Ukrainian*. Ivano-Frankivsk : IFKDGUL, 2015. 527p.
 Norrick N. Interjections / Ed. K. Aijmer & C. Rühlemann. *Corpus Pragmatics : A Handbook*. Cambridge : CUP, 2014. P. 249-276.
 O'Connell et al. Interjections in interviews. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*. 2005. Vol. 34(2). P. 153-71.
 O'Connell Daniel C., Kowal S. Interjections in the performance of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*. *J Psycholinguist. Res*. 2010. Vol.39 (4). P.285-304.
 Stange Ulrike. *Emotive interjections in British English: A corpus-based study on variation in acquisition, function and usage*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2016. 221p.
 Wierzbicka Anna. The semantics of interjection. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 1992. Vol. 18(2-3). P. 159-192
 Wilkins David. Interjections as deictics. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 1992. Vol.18(2-3). P.119-158.

(Матеріал надійшов до редакції 4.04.18. Прийнято до друку 17.04.18)