Міністерство освіти і науки України

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

Курсова робота

на тему: Лінгвістичні та екстралінгвістичні маркери конфлікту у

сучасному англомовному художньому дискурсі

студентки групи Мла 07-20

факультету германської філології і перекладу

денної форми здобуття освіти

спеціальності 035 Філологія

спеціалізації 035.041 Германські мови та літератури

(переклад включно), перша – англійська

освітньо-професійної програми Англійська мова і

друга іноземна мова: усний і письмовий переклад

Семеній Юлії Святославівни

Науковий керівник:

доцент,

Черненко О.В

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2024

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term Paper

Linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in Modern English

Fictional Discourse

YULIA SEMENII

Group _MLA 07-20_

Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof.

OLGA CHERNENKO

Kyiv 2024

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The research relevance. Studying linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in modern English fictional discourse offers valuable insights into the complexities of human interaction and communication. By analyzing how conflict is depicted through language, gestures, tone of voice, spatial positioning, and other linguistic and extralinguistic markers in literature, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of interpersonal dynamics, power struggles, and social relations. This analysis provides a window into the ways authors portray and navigate conflicts within fictional narratives, shedding light on broader themes such as identity, ideology, and societal norms. Moreover, the novel "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak present special environment – totalitarian Nazy Germany, where people were rarely allowed to express emotions directly, so the conflicts were also affected by this factor.

There is wide theoretical background of the research, in particular, works by F. Batsevych, A. Brzozowska, Y. Boiko, M. Jorgensen, O. Kovalchuk, A. Nikitiva, N. Sharmanova, I. Shevchenko on discourse studies, and by O. Chernenko, P. Chilton, N. Fairclough, P. Królikowska, V. Kupchyshyna, S. Leung, K. Lewin, I. Lysychkina, V. Romadykina, N. Voitsekhivska on discourse of conflict. However, there is still a need in thorough research on the specifics of representing linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in certain type of discourse, in particular, fictional one.

The aim of the research is to analyze the linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in modern English fictional discourse based on the novel "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak.

According to the aim, the following **objectives** has been set:

1) to present discourse analysis as a method of linguistic research;

2) to define conflict and characterize its effects on communication;

3) to highlight the specific features of discourse of conflict;

4) to analyze the linguistic markers of conflict in the novel "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak;

5) to determine the extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel;

6) to trace the specifics of interaction of linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel.

The object of the research is the linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in modern English fictional discourse.

The subject of the research is language representation of the linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak.

The research material is text extracts from the novel "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak (2006) including fragments representing the linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict.

The methods of investigation used in the research are general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis, as well as the linguistic methods of contextual, stylistic, pragmatic, discourse analysis.

The practical significance of the research is that the research results are contribution to the theory of communication and discourse analysis as they provide the information about the linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in modern English fictional discourse. Moreover, studying the markers of conflict in fictional discourse can offer practical applications in fields such as psychology, communication studies, and literary analysis, contributing to our understanding of human behavior and communication patterns in real-world contexts.

Brief outline of the research paper structure. The paper consists of Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusions, References, résumé in English and Ukrainian, and one appendix.

CHAPTER 1
CONFLICT WITHIN THE DISCOURSE OF CONFLICT

1.1. Discourse analysis as a method of linguistic research

The modern term discourse is currently popular and encountered even in colloquial language. It is most often used as a synonym of an utterance or discussion. Such understanding of this term is not, however, complete, as one needs to take into account the polymorphic nature and multiplicity of functioning of this term, both in terms of content and scope. In the area of humanities this term is used as a substitute for the terms: language, communication or interaction (Brzozowska et al., 2015: 11).

The term *discourse* can have different meanings. Firstly, it is used to refer to unified, meaningful and purposive stretches of spoken and written language; and, secondly, it is used to refer to the language in action. Last but not least, it is used to refer to the language of particular language variety. Thence, discourse is a multi-disciplinary field which comprises different forms of language in society. Language is a tool of communication that can be used to express ideas, presumptions, suggestions and information (Kleparski & Rusinek, 2007: 328).

Currently, discourse is seen as "a set of statements relating to the definition of a specific issue, closely related to this issue and in mutual relations with each other" (Бацевич, 2003: 281); not only language / speech formation more complex than a single sentence, but a total cultural phenomenon: the result and factor of communication, the interweaving of linguistic interactions of communication agents, the living environment of communication which, as is known, creates new physical actions, mental and psychic products" (Юшкевич, 2016: 15); "language as a social practice determined by social structures" (Fairclough, 2001: 14); "the whole process of production and interpretation, […] the process of social interaction, of which the text is a part" [Fairclough, 2001: 20); "a form of social practice that simultaneously creates the social world and is formed through other

social practices […] is in a dialectical relationship with other social dimensions" (Jorgensen & Philips, 2002: 61). In this research, the interpretation of the discourse is based on the formulation proposed by the Ukrainian researcher I. Shevchenko [114]: discourse is "thought and communicative activity that occurs in a social and cultural context, a combination of process and result" (Шевченко, 2002: 26).

A piece of discourse is an instance of spoken or written language that has describable internal relations of form and meaning (e.g. words, structures, cohesion that relate coherently to an external communicative function of purpose and a given audience / interlocutor. The external function or purpose can only be properly determined, if one takes into account the context and participants (i.e., all the relevant situational, social and cultural factors) in which the piece of discourse occurs (Kleparski & Rusinek, 2007: 328).

The study of discourse, like of any complex scientific concept, is based on methodological principles formed in the study of discourse, which is known under the names "discourse theory", "discourse analysis". Such study, based on general scientific and linguistic research methods, developed such research methods and techniques that contributed to the allocation of discourse into a separate scientific (primarily linguistic) category (Бойко, 2023: 136).

Discourse analysis studies language in the context of society, history, culture, politics, and other areas in which verbal means help to realize certain aims. According to this understanding, discourse analysis is a branch of linguistics and a construct of social sciences (Ковальчук, 2020: 240). Discourse analysis is aimed at solving social problems which are enshrined in the following fundamental principles: 1) discourse is a form of social action; 2) discourse (especially historical) constructs society and culture; 3) discourse analysis examines social problems; 4) discourse performs an ideological function; 5) discourse analysis deals with the interpretation of textual material; 6) the connection between the text and society is mediated (Yule, 2010: 55).

The method of discourse analysis plays a key role in the analysis of various types of discourse and makes it possible to focus attention not only on the surface

characteristics of the text, but also on a number of extralingual factors (Ковальчук, 2030: 240). Given the fact that the discourse is "a series of texts actualized in the speech context united by a common situational theme and determined by extralinguistic factors, containing specific conditions of the course of communication (chronos, topos), characteristics of the communication channel, social features of communication participants, non-verbal means, etc." (Шарманова, 2020: 113), and discourse analysis is used to identify the social, mental, and cultural context of speech (Нікітіна, 2015: 198), discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary study, and the methodology of discourse analysis involves the application of methods of related disciplines, such as, in particular, linguistic and cultural studies, literary studies, and linguistics itself (Бойко, 2023: 136).

Thus, discourse analysis, as a branch of linguistics and social sciences, delves into understanding language within broader societal, historical, and political frameworks. Its methodology, rooted in discourse theory, enables the exploration of text alongside extralinguistic factors to unveil the intricate connections between language and society. Through interdisciplinary approaches drawing from linguistics, cultural studies, and more, discourse analysis seeks to decode the complexities of communication, revealing its role in constructing social realities and ideologies.

1.2. Conflict and its effects on communication

Conflicts are an integral part of social life and culture and one of the determining factors in the growth of social risks in society. The concept of conflict belongs to both everyday consciousness and science, which gives it its specific meaning. Probably, every person understands what it means, but this does not make its meaning any simpler (Ромадикіна, 2014: 108).

Conflicts as an important aspect of social connections, interactions and relationships of people; their behavior and actions have attracted attention since ancient times. Evidence of this is the mythology and religion of various peoples,

folklore and monuments of ancient literature, views of ancient and medieval thinkers, achievements of social and humanitarian sciences. The history of human development from ancient times to the present day testifies that there have always been, are and will be conflicts (Ромадикіна, 2013: 160).

The term conflict originates from the Latin word *conflictus* which in exact translation means "collision", and in an arbitrary translation – "counteraction", "opposition" (Ромадикіна, 2014: 108). In psychology, a conflict is an actualized contradiction, a clash of oppositely directed interests, goals, positions, opinions, views of subjects of interaction or opponents, as well as a clash of the opponents themselves (Звєрєва, 2012: 339).

One of the main reasons for conflicts is the psychological characteristics of a person which depend on the pattern of his behavior and satisfaction urgent personal needs. They are especially manifested when a person is given significant power over others and the ability to make a decision. In the psychological structure of such a person, the peculiarities of the manifestation of the features of one's temperament, character and level of personal development are distinguished. One's temperament affects the pace and speed of his mental processes, states and behavior. Scientific research results have proven that of all types of temperaments (according to the humoral theory), a choleric can be a participant in a conflict situation more quickly than a phlegmatic due to certain characteristics (Купчишина & Грубі, 2024: 221). Conflict has generally been negatively viewed, and unvalued in most disciplines. It is often seen as destructive, disruptive, hostile, and aggressive behavior (Leung, 2002: 1).

K. Lewin (1997) proposed a classification of conflicts, which is still considered classic, by distinguishing three main types of choice: 1) "desire – desire" when the subject is forced to choose between two positive options with a very similar degree of attractiveness (for example, rest at the sea or in the mountains); 2) "avoidance – avoidance" when the subject is forced to choose between two negative options with a very similar degree of aversion (to perform work tasks on weekends or during the night period, both options undesirable);

3) "desire – avoidance", when a specific decision-making option causes both positive and negative feelings in the subject (for example, the patient wants to restore health, but is afraid of surgery) (Lewin, 1997: 26-28).

Thus, denoting collision or opposition, conflicts manifest as clashes of interests, goals, and viewpoints, epitomizing the complexity inherent in interpersonal dynamics. Rooted in psychological factors, conflicts arise from the interplay of individual temperament, character traits, and power dynamics, with certain temperaments predisposing individuals to engage in conflict more readily than others.

1.3. Discourse of conflict: definition and characteristic features

Since the links between discourse and social reality are unquestionable, the mutual influence of language and social phenomena (including conflict) on the organization of social reality is immense. Ehe research on the discourse of conflict comes into view as a compelling and interesting, yet – through its complexity and heterogeneity – undoubtedly challenging area of discourse studies (Królikowska, 2015: 120).

Discourse of conflict is defined as a dynamic process of verbal and non-verbal counter-directional actions of communicants in socially marked situations characterized by a confrontational discourse strategy and accompanied by negative emotions (Chilton, 1997: 176). Moreover, it is viewed as a communicative and mental activity, which includes both process and result aspects and comprises a set of its static and dynamic characteristics (Войцехівська 2018: 22). Discourse of conflict is a linguistic interaction of the interlocutors, the illocutionary dominant of which is characterized by the presence of a clash of communicative goals, as a result of which, in general, the consequent is characterized by the fact that the participants of the discourse feel different emotions due to the verbal influence on each other (Лисичкіна et al., 2018: 60).

Regarding its static characteristics, which are invariable, fixed components in the "cut" of the conflict discourse, the participants of the conflict, its object, conditions and circumstances of conflict communication, conflict images and the incident are highlighted. As far as dynamic characteristics are concerned, the processual approach is taken into account, namely the successive stages or deployment phases of conflict communication (Chernenko, 2019: 4). The conflict orientation of the discourse is connected with the role performed by each of the communicators, whose illocutionary intentions are opposite. Communicants in the discourse of conflict are in a state of conflict. Linguistic means of representing "hostility" are the semantic basis of the functioning of the conflict discourse. The intensity of the distribution and the reasons for the appearance of conflict markers, which, in turn, can be non-verbal / verbal, imilicit / exilicit, depend on the illocutionary intentions of the communicators of the conflict discourse (Лисичкіна et al., 2018: 60).

Hence, defined as a dynamic interplay of verbal and non-verbal actions characterized by confrontational strategies and emotive exchanges, conflict discourse encapsulates both communicative and cognitive dimensions, encompassing static components such as participants, objects, and circumstances, as well as dynamic phases of communication deployment.

Conclusions to Chapter 1

Discourse is thought and communicative activity that occurs in a social and cultural context, a combination of process and result. It encompasses various forms of language in societal contexts, from unified stretches of communication to the manifestation of language in action and within particular language varieties. Discourse analysis, as a branch of linguistics and social sciences, examines language within broader societal, historical, and political frameworks, employing methods from related disciplines like cultural studies and literary studies to decode the complexities of communication. Anchored in discourse theory, it unveils the

intricate connections between language and society, revealing the role of language in constructing social realities and ideologies. Through attention to both surface characteristics and extralinguistic factors, discourse analysis serves as an interdisciplinary endeavor aimed at understanding the dynamics of communication and their implications for society.

Conflicts, inherent to social life and culture, are complex phenomena deeply ingrained in human interactions, influencing societal dynamics and posing significant risks to social cohesion. A conflict is an actualized contradiction, a clash of oppositely directed interests, goals, positions, opinions, views of subjects of interaction or opponents, as well as a clash of the opponents themselves. While conflicts have traditionally been perceived negatively, as disruptive and hostile, they are integral to human behavior and decision-making processes.

Discourse of conflict is a linguistic interaction of the interlocutors, the illocutionary dominant of which is characterized by the presence of a clash of communicative goals, as a result of which, in general, the consequent is characterized by the fact that the participants of the discourse feel different emotions due to the verbal influence on each other. The static characteristics of discourse of conflict include its participants, object, conditions, circumstances, conflict images, and incidents, while the dynamic aspects encompass successive stages or phases of conflict communication, where the orientation of discourse is influenced by the opposing illocutionary intentions of communicators, reflecting linguistic means of hostility representation dependent on communicators' intentions.

CHAPTER 2
LINGUISTIC AND EXTRALINGUISTIC MARKERS OF CONFLICT
IN ENGLISH FICTIONAL DISCOURSE: BASED ON *THE BOOK THIEF*
BY MARKUS ZUSAK

2.1. Linguistic markers of conflict in the novel

"The Book Thief" by M. Zusak is a historical novel set in Nazi Germany during World War II. It tells the story of Liesel Meminger, a young girl living with a foster family, and her experiences as she navigates the challenges and horrors of the war (Zhukovska, 2023: 129). In "The Book Thief", characters adapt their communication using both verbal and non-verbal means (ibid: 132) including the means of expressing themselves in conflicts.

The linguistic markers of conflict in the novel represent verbal communication of the characters. Verbal communication refers to the use of sounds and language to relay a message. Verbal communication is simply the communication that is expressed through words. It serves as a vehicle for expressing desires, ideas and concepts and is vital to the processes of learning and teaching. In combination with nonverbal forms of communication, verbal communication acts as the primary tool for expression between two or more people. Signs and symbols are the major signals that make up verbal communication. Words act as symbols, and signs are secondary products of the underlying message and include things like tone of voice, blushing and facial expressions (Tracii, 2024).

In particular, in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak, the basic linguistic marker of conflict is offensive words. For example, offensive words are widely used by Liesel's stepmother in the process of girl's education: *She looked over at her husband. "And him over there." She seemed to collect the words in her hand, pat them together, and hurl them across the table. "That Saukerl, that filthy pig – you call him Papa, verstehst? Understand?"* (Zusak, 2006: 25). Here, words *saukerl*

(German "pig") and *filthy pig* are used as offensive epithets for Rosa's husband. She earns by doing laundry, so calling the family members "pigs" became like professional deformation for her, although, in the end of the story the reader understands that she supposed no offence in these words, rather was trying to look strict enough to be respected, so here is a conflict rather based on respect than on aggression: *For me, there was only a Rosa, and yes, I truly think I picked her up midsnore, for her mouth was open and her papery pink lips were still in the act of moving. If she'd seen me, I'm sure she would have called me a Saukerl, though I would not have taken it badly* (Zusak, 2006: 356).

In other cases, offensive words directly represent trying to dominate upon others through aggression, for example: *In the break, she was taunted. A boy named Ludwig Schmeikl came up to her with a book. "Hey, Liesel," he said to her, "I'm having trouble with this word. Could you read it for me?" He laughed – a ten-year-old, smugness laughter. "You Dummkopf – you idiot"* (Zusak, 2006: 53). In this text fragment, offensive words *dummkopf* (German "stupid"), *idiot* are used by Ludwig Schmeikl really with the aim to offend the girl who is not able to read.

Another example is the following text fragment: *Viktor came casually closer again and faced him. He gave him a gentle rub on the arm. A whisper. "Unless you want me to turn that blood into a fountain, I suggest you go away, little boy." He looked at Liesel. "And take the little slut with you"* (Zusak, 2006: 189). Here, the older boy calls a girl *little slut* in order to insult both her and the younger boy and thus provoke a conflict as the younger boy could want to protect his friend.

Another verbal marker of conflict here is direct threat expressed in the words *Unless you want me to turn that blood into a fountain, I suggest you go away, little boy*. It starts with adverb *unless* stating that the fight is still avoidable, however, in the case that the younger boy does what the older boy says. The threat itself is expressed using metaphor *to turn that blood into a fountain* which characterized the intentions of the party of the conflict to physical violence.

Also, one of the verbal markers of conflict in the novel is other curse words such as *Lick my ass!* in the following text fragment used in order to protect

personal space and habits in communication: *As he walked up Himmel Street, Mama would open the window and cry out, "Don't be home too late!" "Not so loud," he would turn and call back. "Saukerl! Lick my ass! I'll speak as loud as I want!"* (Zusak, 2006: 29).

Semantic repetitions can be used as verbal marker of conflict in cases when the person wants to stress that he or she is tired to say one and the same thing: *"Rosa," Hans said to her at one point. Quietly, his words cut through one of her sentences. "Could you do me a favor?" She looked up from the stove. "What?" "I'm asking you, I'm begging you, could you please shut your mouth for just five minutes?"* (Zusak, 2006: 48) Here, Hans says *I'm asking you, I'm begging you* to his wife trying to say that he is tired to ask her stop arguing, and she never listens to him.

Another example of using repetition as a verbal marker of conflict in the novel is repeating the interlocutor's phrase with new meaning in order to state that the interlocutor is not right: *"Jesse Owens?" Mr. Steiner was the type of man who was very wooden. His voice was angular and true. His body was tall and heavy, like oak. His hair was like splinters. "What about him?" "You know, Papa, the Black Magic one." "I'll give you black magic." He caught his son's ear between his thumb and forefinger* (Zusak, 2006: 40). Here, Rudy tells father about Jesse Owens, black sprinter calling him *the Black Magic one*. Understanding that, in the Nazi Germany, a boy must not like people of that race, Rudy's father says *I'll give you black magic* treating to beat the boy.

Rhetorical questions and immediate answering them are another spread verbal marker of conflict, for example: *When her birthday came around, there was no gift. There was no gift because there was no money, and at the time, Papa was out of tobacco. "I told you." Mama pointed a finger at him. "I told you not to give her both books at Christmas. But no. Did you listen? Of course not!"* (Zusak, 2006: 66). Here, Rosa swears her husband for spending extra money at books rather than using these money for something other. She says that she already told

him to do so, but he did not listen. So, to stress on her irritation, she asks *Did you listen?* and immediately herself answers *Of course not!*

Thus, the conducted analysis reveals that the linguistic markers of conflict in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak (see Appendix A) are offensive words, curse words, direct treats, lexical and semantic repetitions and immediately answered rhetorical question.

2.2. Extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel

The extralinguistic markers on conflict in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak are presented by description of nonverbal communication. Nonverbal communication is usually understood as the process of communication through sending and receiving wordless (mostly visual) messages between people. Messages can be communicated through gestures and touch, by body language or posture, by facial expression and eye contact. The nonverbal aspect of communication is easiest when the environment is right for all communicators involved, such as, when the environment is right or the moment is right. Nonverbal communication is an important aspect in any conversation skill people are practicing. Nonverbal communication will inhibit someone to be able to tell other person how they are really feeling without having to voice any opinions. People can interpret body signals better than they can talk most of the time (Hogan & Stubbs, 2003: 5).

The extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel are thus the nonverbal parameters of communication. In in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak these are often characteristics of voice, in particular, its tone as in the following example: *After a few months, they were no longer Mr. and Mrs. Hubermann. With a <u>typical fistful of words</u>, Rosa said, "Now listen, Liesel – from now on you call me Mama"* (Zusak, 2006: 25). In this case, a metaphor *fistful of words* is used to characterize rude manner of communication typical for Liesel's stepmother Rosa, who utters almost anything as if there is a conflict situation already.

Another characteristic feature of voice as a marker of conflict is its loudness, for example: *She would grin herself stupid, watching the lines drawing themselves down his face and the soft metal of his eyes – until <u>the swearing arrived from the kitchen</u>. "<u>STOPTHATNOISE, SAUKERL</u>!" Papa would play a little longer* (Zusak, 2006: 27). In the presented text fragment, even font *STOPTHATNOISE, SAUKERL!* is used to characterize Rosa's irritated shouting.

Not only loud voice can be considered as a marker of conflict. For example, the following text fragment: *Without turning around, Papa <u>answered calmly, but with venom</u>, "Well, don't ask her, either." He dropped some ash outside. "She left school in third grade"* (Zusak, 2006: 28). Here, Hans answers *calmly*, however, he seems really insulted by his wife, so the calm voice has *venomous* tone to show her that he disagrees.

Apart from voice, the gestures can be a marker of the conflict situation, for example: *"Ohhh," moaned Papa with delight. The flag cloaked his back from the top of the window. "You should have a look at this woman I can see." He glanced over his shoulder and grinned at Liesel. "I might just go and run after her. She leaves you for dead, Mama." "Schwein!" <u>She shook the wooden spoon at him</u>* (Zusak, 2006: 69). Here, Rosa treats her stepdaughter by shaking the spoon in front of her but still does not touch her.

The important extralinguistic marker of conflict is position of the characters in the space. The closer they become, the more tense is a conflict, for example: *She broke. "I spent it, Mama." <u>Rosa came closer</u>. This was not a good sign. <u>She was very close to the wooden spoons</u>. "You what?"* (Zusak, 2006: 67) In the presented text fragment, Rosa's approximation is perceived by Liesel as a treat as the first one could beat the latter.

Physical contact is another extralinguistic marker of conflict. In particular, it can represent disrespect and be a call for more severe physical actions from the opponent: *Nearing the end of the break, the tally of comments stood at nineteen. By the twentieth, she snapped. It was Schmeikl, back for more. "Come on, Liesel." <u>He stuck the book under her nose</u>. "Help me out, will you?"* (Zusak, 2006: 53) The

presented text fragment describes the situation when a boy is bullying a girl not yet using physical force but already violating her physical borders.

The culmination of conflict is a fight. In "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak it is described in different ways. First variant is from the point of view of one beating: *She stood up and took the book from him, and as he smiled over his shoulder at some other kids, she threw it away and kicked him as hard as she could in the vicinity of the groin* (Zusak, 2006: 53). Here, active grammatical constructions are used in order to present the character's actions as a resistance to the evil in the form of annoying boy.

Further, using passive constructions, the author switches to the perspective of one beaten in order to show that the angry but weaker boy could not resist the main character's anger: *Well, as you might imagine, Ludwig Schmeikl certainly buckled, and on the way down, he was punched in the ear. When he landed, he was set upon. When he was set upon, he was slapped and clawed and obliterated by a girl who was utterly consumed with rage. His skin was so warm and soft. Her knuckles and fingernails were so frighteningly tough, despite their smallness* (Zusak, 2006: 53).

In describing the fight, the body parts can be characterized as separate actors of the conflict, for example: *She did not have time, for Viktor Chemmel was on top of Rudy before she could utter a word. His knees had pinned Rudy's arms and his hands were around his throat. The apples were scooped up by none other than Andy Schmeikl, at Viktor's request* (Zusak, 2006: 189). Here, the author describes the boy's actions through the description of his body parts' actions with the aim to state that the whole boy, the whole his body, is aggressive.

Interesting example is the description of the person's action using the description of the inanimate objects' actions: *Before she could answer, the wooden spoon came down on Liesel Meminger's body like the gait of God. Red marks like footprints, and they burned. From the floor, when it was over, the girl actually looked up and explained* (Zusak, 2006: 67). Here is the example when Rosa beaten her stepdaughter with spoon. However, the author does not describe her as a really

bad characters, so the fighting is performed by spoons rather than by the woman herself.

Several extralinguistic markers of conflict in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak can interact to create the holistic picture of the characters' emotions, for example: *Liesel didn't mind.* <u>*She didn't whine or moan or stamp her feet*</u>*. She simply* <u>*swallowed the disappointment*</u> *and decided on one calculated risk – a present from herself. She would gather all of the accrued letters to her mother, stuff them into one envelope, and use just a tiny portion of the washing and ironing money to mail it* (Zusak, 2006: 66). Here, the author first describes the complex of nonverbal actions typical for the child in similar situation (*whine or moan or stamp her feet*), and then contrasts them with Liesel's actual behavior who just *swallowed the disappointment* (apparently also swallowing drool not to cry) and made a plan of actions.

The conducted research thus reveals that the extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel can describe the stage of the conflict (see Appendix A): it is voice, gestures at the beginning of the conflict, and the sharpest phase of the conflict is revealed through the description of the character's approximation to each other, violating physical space and actual fighting.

2.3. Interaction of linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel

In the everyday life, the interaction between linguistic and extralinguistic markers while conflicting is on subconscious level. Conflict situation supported by words is usually completed be conflict-related facial expressions, gestures and actions.

One of the examples of such interaction in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak is as follows: *The tall one was losing patience. "Why not?" And the smaller one* <u>*damn near exploded*</u>*. He looked up at the tall one's chin and* <u>*cried*</u>*, "*<u>*Spinnst du?!*</u> <u>*Are you stupid*</u>*?!"* (Zusak, 2006: 9). In the presented text fragment, the two

gravemen are arguing what to do with the small boy's body. The older one is irritated by the younger one's proposition to leave it. Verbally, it is expressed in rhetorical question with offence: *Spinnst du?!* (German "Are you insane?") *Are you stupid?!* The exclamation marks also tell the reader about the voice loudness, as well as the verb *cried*. The overall character's state is also described by the words *damn near exploded*.

However, linguistic and extralinguistic markers of person's behavior can contradict if the conflict is imitated for other purposes. It is, for example, when Rosa comes to Liesel's school to tell her that Max is alive. At the beginning of the scene, the conflict is obvious: *"What, Mama?" She turned. "Don't you 'what Mama' me, you little Saumensch!" Liesel was gored by the speed of it. "My hairbrush!" A trickle of laughter rolled from under the door, but it was drawn instantly back* (Zusak, 2006: 226). Here, the verbal markers definitely indicate the conflict: the character uses repetitions as a marker of irritation (*"What, Mama?" She turned. "Don't you 'what Mama' me, you little Saumensch!"*) as well as direct offence *Saumensch*.

However, later, the reader understands that the verbal markers contradict nonverbal ones: *"Mama?" Her face was severe, but it was smiling. "What the hell did you do with my hairbrush, you stupid Saumensch, you little thief? I've told you a hundred times to leave that thing alone, but do you listen? Of course not!" The tirade went on for perhaps another minute, with Liesel making a desperate suggestion or two about the possible location of the said brush. It ended abruptly, with Rosa pulling Liesel close, just for a few seconds. Her whisper was almost impossible to hear, even at such close proximity. "You told me to yell at you. You said they'd all believe it." She looked left and right, her voice like needle and thread. "He woke up, Liesel. He's awake." From her pocket, she pulled out the toy soldier with the scratched exterior. "He said to give you this. It was his favorite." She handed it over, held her arms tightly, and smiled. Before Liesel had a chance to answer, she finished it off. "Well? Answer me! Do you have any other idea where you might have left it?"* (Zusak, 2006: 226). Here, mimics of the characters

is itself contradicting (*severe,* and at the time *smiling*), while she still uses conflict language (curse words *the hell*; offence *Saumensch, thief;* rhetorical question with immediate answer *but do you listen? Of course not!*). Later, the nonverbal behavior is doubtful (*with Rosa pulling Liesel close, just for a few seconds* which can be both aggressive and similar to hugs), while further Rosa demonstrates non-conflict behavior using whisper instead of crying (*whisper was almost impossible to hear*), even calm voice (metaphor *her voice like needle and thread*), and further even loving family attitudes are revealed (*held her arms tightly, and smiled*). However, steel needing to pretend angry mother, at the end of the conversation she turns to the verbal behavior of conflict again: *Well? Answer me! Do you have any other idea where you might have left it?*

Thus, it was revealed that the linguistic and extralinguistic markers in conflict situation can interact in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak in two different ways: they can be in line with each other in the case of real conflict, and can contradict each other while characters pretend to have conflict. The latter is connected with the specifics of life in totalitarian Nazy Germany where much information should be hidden from "others'" eyes.

Conclusions to Chapter 2

In "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak, linguistic markers of conflict are prevalent, ranging from offensive epithets like *pig* and *slut* used by characters to assert dominance or provoke reactions, to direct threats and curse words employed to intimidate or defend personal boundaries. Semantic repetitions and rhetorical questions are also utilized as linguistic markers of conflict, serving to emphasize frustration or challenge opposing viewpoints within the narrative. Through linguistic markers, characters in the novel adapt their communication to navigate various conflicts and power dynamics, underscoring the complexity of interpersonal relationships amidst the backdrop of Nazi Germany during World War II.

Extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel are depicted through descriptions of nonverbal communication, including tone of voice, gestures, spatial positioning, physical contact, and fights in the culmination of conflict. Characters' voices, ranging from loudness to calmness with venomous undertones, serve as indicators of tension and disagreement, while gestures such as shaking a spoon or physical proximity convey hostility. Spatial positioning, like moving closer or physical contact, signifies escalating conflict, leading to confrontations and fights. The narrative portrays conflicts through both active and passive perspectives, detailing actions and reactions during altercations. Furthermore, combinations of these markers provide insights into characters' emotions and responses within conflict situations, adding depth to their interactions and motivations.

Conflicts involve both linguistic and extralinguistic markers, often operating at a subconscious level. Verbal expressions of conflict are typically accompanied by corresponding facial expressions, gestures, and actions. In "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak, characters' disagreements are portrayed through both words and nonverbal cues. However, the alignment between linguistic and extralinguistic markers can be disrupted if conflicts are feigned for other purposes. An example is when Liesel's foster mother, Rosa, initially appears angry but later reveals a hidden agenda with conflicting verbal and nonverbal cues. This complexity underscores the intricate nature of human communication, where conflicts may not always align with outward expressions, revealing the subtleties of interpersonal dynamics and underlying motivations.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Discourse encompasses language use within social contexts, blending thought and communication processes. Discourse analysis, as part of linguistics and social sciences, studies language within broader societal frameworks, revealing its role in shaping social realities and ideologies. By examining both surface features and extralinguistic factors, discourse analysis offers an interdisciplinary approach to understanding communication dynamics and societal implications.

Conflicts, integral to human interactions, represent clashes between opposing interests, goals, and opinions, shaping societal dynamics and posing risks to social cohesion. Despite their negative connotations, conflicts are inherent to human behavior, influencing decision-making processes and societal development.

Discourse of conflict is a linguistic interaction of the interlocutors, the illocutionary dominant of which is characterized by the presence of a clash of communicative goals, as a result of which, in general, the consequent is characterized by the fact that the participants of the discourse feel different emotions due to the verbal influence on each other. The static features of conflict discourse cover its participants, object, conditions, circumstances, conflict images, and incidents, while the dynamic aspects include stages of communication. The orientation of discourse is influenced by opposing illocutionary intentions, shaping linguistic representations of hostility based on communicators' aims.

In "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak, the linguistic markers of conflict are prevalent, ranging from offensive epithets like *pig* and *slut* used by characters to assert dominance or provoke reactions, to direct threats and curse words employed to intimidate or defend personal boundaries. Semantic repetitions and rhetorical questions also serve as the linguistic markers of conflict emphasizing frustration or challenging opposing viewpoints.

Extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel involve nonverbal cues such as tone of voice, gestures, spatial positioning, physical contact, and fights in the culmination. Variations in characters' voices, from loud to calm with underlying

tension, reflect disagreement, while gestures like shaking a spoon or physical approximation indicate hostility. Changes in spatial positioning and physical contact signal escalating conflict, leading to confrontations. The narrative presents conflicts from active and passive viewpoints, detailing actions and reactions during altercations. The combination of these markers offers insights into characters' emotions and reactions, enriching their interactions and motivations.

Conflicts involve both linguistic and extralinguistic markers, often operating at a subconscious level. Verbal expressions of conflict are typically accompanied by corresponding facial expressions, gestures, and actions. In "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak, characters' disagreements are portrayed through both words and nonverbal cues. However, the alignment between linguistic and extralinguistic markers can be disrupted if conflicts are feigned for other purposes.

The research reveals wide prospects for further studies including, in particular, creating the inventory of linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict, as well as their description from the perspectives of discourse analysis and cognitive linguistics.

RÉSUMÉ

The research paper deals with the analysis of the linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict in modern English fictional discourse based on the novel "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak.

In the course of the research, discourse analysis was presented as a method of linguistic research stating that discourse analysis, as part of linguistics and social sciences, studies language within broader societal frameworks, revealing its role in shaping social realities and ideologies. By examining both surface features and extralinguistic factors, discourse analysis offers an interdisciplinary approach to understanding communication dynamics and societal implications. It was revealed that conflicts, integral to human interactions, represent clashes between opposing interests, goals, and opinions, shaping societal dynamics and posing risks to social cohesion. Discourse of conflict is a linguistic interaction of the interlocutors, the illocutionary dominant of which is characterized by the presence of a clash of communicative goals, as a result of which, the participants of the discourse feel different emotions due to the verbal influence on each other.

Based on the research material which is text extracts from the novel "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak including fragments representing the linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict, it was revealed that the linguistic markers of conflict are prevalent, ranging from offensive epithets to direct threats and curse words, lexical and semantic repetitions and rhetorical questions. The extralinguistic markers of conflict in the novel involve nonverbal cues such as tone of voice, gestures, spatial positioning, physical contact, and fights in the culmination. As conflicts involve both linguistic and extralinguistic markers, verbal expressions of conflict are typically accompanied by corresponding facial expressions, gestures, and actions. However, the alignment between linguistic and extralinguistic markers can be disrupted if conflicts are feigned for other purposes.

Keywords: discourse, discourse analysis, discourse of conflict, linguistic and extralinguistic markers, verbal and nonverbal means.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Дослідження присвячено аналізу лінгвістичних та екстралінгвістичних маркерів конфлікту в сучасному англомовному художньому дискурсі на прикладі роману М. Зусака «Крадійка книжок».

У ході дослідження дискурс-аналіз представлено як розділ лінгвістики та соціальних наук вивчає мову в ширших суспільних рамках, розкриваючи її роль у формуванні соціальних реалій та ідеологій. Досліджуючи як поверхневі особливості, так і екстралінгвістичні фактори, дискурс-аналіз пропонує міждисциплінарний підхід до розуміння динаміки комунікації та суспільних наслідків. Виявлено, що конфлікти, невід'ємна частина людської взаємодії, являють собою зіткнення між протилежними інтересами, цілями та думками, формуючи суспільну динаміку та створюючи ризики для соціальної згуртованості. Конфліктний дискурс – це мовна взаємодія співрозмовників, ілокутивна домінанта якої характеризується наявністю зіткнення комунікативних цілей, унаслідок чого учасники дискурсу відчувають різні емоції внаслідок вербального впливу один на одного.

На матеріалі дослідження, представленому уривками з тексту роману М. Зусака «Крадійка книжок», які репрезентують лінгвістичні та екстралінгвістичні маркери конфлікту, виявлено, що мовні маркери конфлікту, починаючи від образливих епітетів до прямих погроз і лайки, лексико-семантичних повторів та риторичних запитань, переважають. Екстралінгвістичні маркери конфлікту в романі включають невербальні ознаки, такі як тон голосу, жести, просторове розташування, фізичний контакт і бійки в кульмінації. Оскільки конфлікти включають як лінгвістичні, так і екстралінгвістичні маркери, вербальне вираження конфлікту зазвичай супроводжується відповідною мімікою, жестами та діями. Однак узгодження між лінгвістичними та екстралінгвістичними маркерами може бути порушено, якщо конфлікти вдаються з іншою метою.

Ключові слова: дискурс, дискурс-аналіз, дискурс конфлікту, лінгвістичні та екстралінгвістичні маркери, вербальні та невербальні засоби.

REFERENCES

Бацевич, Ф. С. (2003). *Нариси з комунікативної лінгвістики*. Львів: Вид. центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка.

Бойко, Я. В. (2023). *Когнітивно-дискурсивна модель діахронної множинності перекладів часово віддаленого першотвору (на матеріалі українських ретрансляцій трагедій В. Шекспіра XIX–XXI століть)* [Дисертація доктора філологічних наук, Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна]. Харків.

Войцехівська, Н. К. (2018). *Конфліктний дискурс: Структурно-семантичний і комунікативно-прагматичний аспекти*. Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго.

Звєрєва, І. Д. (ред). (2012). *Енциклопедія для фахівців соціальної сфери*. Київ: Універсум.

Ковальчук, О. (2020). Підходи до визначення дискурсивного аналізу. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. Серія: Мовознавство. Літературознавство, 30 (2), 239-243.

Купчишина, В. Ч., Грубі, Т. В. (2024). Індивідуально-особистісні якості особистості як один із факторів виникнення сімейних конфліктів. *Габітус*, 57, 220-225.

Лисичкіна, І. О., Лисичкіна, О. О., Джулай, А. О. (2018). Емоційний компонент конфліктного дискурсу в аспекті англо-українського перекладу. *Закарпатські філологічні студії*, 5 (2), 59-63.

Нікітіна, А. (2015). Формування дослідницької компетентності магістрантів-філологів засобами дискурсу. *Педагогіка вищої та середньої школи*, 46, 195-201.

Ромадикіна, В. С. (2013). Проблема вимірів конфліктності в соціальній сфері та рівні її осмислення. *Розвиток сучасного українського соціуму: Матер. Всеукр. наук.-теор. Інтернет-конф. 31 січня 2013 р.* (сс. 160-165). Донецьк: ДонНУЕТ.

Ромадикіна, В. С. (2014). Конфлікт як соціально-психологічний феномен: спроба філософського осмислення його сутності. *Філософія і політологія в контексті сучасної культури*, 8, 107-111.

Шарманова, Н. (2020). До питання про дискурс-аналіз кліше наукового тексту. *Філологічний часопис*, 2 (16), 111-119.

Шевченко, І. С. (ред.). (2002). *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен*. Харків: Константа.

Юшкевич, В. І. (2016). *Тематичні моделі англомовного ділового дискурсу* [Дисертація кандидата філологічних наук, Житомирський державний університет імені Івана Франка]. Житомир.

Brzozowska, A., Kalinichenko, A., Kabus, J. (2015). Analysis of strategies for media discourse management. *Eastern-European Journal of Enterprise Technologies*, 5/3 (77), 10-14.

Chernenko, O. (2019). Pragmatic peculiarities of the final phase of conflict interaction in fiction discourse. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow,* IV (1), 2-48.

Chilton, P. (1997). The role of language in human conflict: Prolegomena to the investigation of language as a factor in conflict causation and resolution. *Current issues in language and society*, 3 (4), 174-189.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Hogan, K., Stubbs, R. (2003). *Can't get Through 8 Barriers to Communication*. Grenta, LA: Pelican Publishing Company.

Jorgensen, M., Philips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage Publications.

Kleparski, G. A., Rusinek, A. (2007). The tradition of field theory and the study of lexical semantic change. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego*, 47, 188-205.

Królikowska, P. (2015). *Discourse of conflict as political genre* [Doctoral Thesis, University of Lodz]. Łódź.

Leung, S. (2002). Conflict Talk: A Discourse Analytical Perspective. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*. https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D8FB52F2.

Lewin, K. (1997). *Resolving social conflicts & Field theory in social science*. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.

Tracii, H. (2024). *What is verbal communication?* http://www.livestrong.com/article/150573-what-is-verbal-communication/.

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* [4th ed.]. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zhukovska, A. V. (2023). Verbal and non-verbal markers of emotional intelligence in fiction: case study of The Book Thief by Markus Zusak. *Закарпатські філологічні студії*, 29 (1), 128-132.

Zusak, M. (2006). *The Book Thief*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

APPENDIX A

**Linguistic and extralinguistic markers of conflict
in "The Book Thief" by M. Zusak**

Linguistic markers	Extralinguistic markers
offensive words	voice tone
curse words	voice loudness
direct treats	gestures
repetitions	spatial positioning
rhetorical questions	physical contact