

ЯЗЫКИ НАРОДОВ ЗАРУБЕЖНЫХ СТРАН (С УКАЗАНИЕМ КОНКРЕТНОГО ЯЗЫКА ИЛИ ГРУППЫ ЯЗЫКОВ) / LANGUAGES OF PEOPLES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES (INDICATING A SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OR GROUP OF LANGUAGES)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2023.40.16>

ATTRIBUTION RELATIONS IN RHETORICAL STRUCTURE ANNOTATION – DATA FROM JAPANESE FICTION

Research article

Chironov S.V.^{1,*}

¹ ORCID : 0000-0003-4960-3294;

¹ Moscow State Institute of International Relations, Moscow, Russian Federation

* Corresponding author (s.chironov[at]jinno.mgimo.ru)

Abstract

This paper is a report of a practical study in annotation of a piece of short fiction in Japanese, as part of a wider research program on text connectives. This time it focuses on relations of Attribution, relatively salient in fiction. Technically Attribution is often filed in the category of Expansion relations, either as Elaboration or Generalization, which does not fully reflect its role in the structure of the text, at least not in fiction. Starting with relations between spoken speech and author's comment, we propose to treat markings of such kind of relations as a special interface in a text, that is universally polyphonic and comprises, beside quoted dialogue, the layers of mental activity and perception, all brought down to Attribution relations at large.

Keywords: Japanese language, text structure, rhetoric relations, attribution, annotation.

ОТНОШЕНИЯ АТРИБУЦИИ В АННОТАЦИИ КОННЕКТОРОВ – ДАННЫЕ ЯПОНСКОЙ ПРОЗЫ

Научная статья

Чиронов С.В.^{1,*}

¹ ORCID : 0000-0003-4960-3294;

¹ Московский Государственный Институт Международных Отношений МИД РФ, Москва, Российская Федерация

* Корреспондирующий автор (s.chironov[at]jinno.mgimo.ru)

Аннотация

В статье используются данные аннотации логико-семантических отношений на материале небольшого рассказа на японском языке, составляющую часть проекта по изучению японских коннекторов. Особенность художественного текста – обилие отношений атрибуции, которые представляют немалую сложность с точки зрения их репрезентации в общей (древесной) структуре текста. Обычно атрибуция трактуется как отношения уточнения или обобщения, однако однозначного решения этого вопроса в этих рамках получить не удаётся. Скорее предлагается обозначать данные отношения как универсальный интерфейс для отражения полифонического строения текста. В такой набор отношений помимо прямой речи попадают также переходы между повествованием и ментальной реальностью героев, а также, в расширенном варианте, перцептивные конструкции.

Ключевые слова: японский язык, аннотация, структура текста, логико-семантические отношения, атрибуция.

Introduction

It may be said that an adequate representation of Attribution relations represents a noticeable stumbling block for annotation techniques. Annotation in itself is absolutely indispensable as a practical way of testing any text structure theory. However, a reference to the authorship of a saying, or a thought, working as an intrusion on a meta-level, poses a challenge to a clear-cut hierarchy of rhetorical relations. Fragments evoking Attribution tend to jut out from linearly developing texture of discourse units, creating loops and crossing ties. Moreover, interpositions of revive the age-old issue of the admissibility of discontinuous units in text – see the general move from = 'no' to a shy 'yes' there in [9]. All in all, one may be tempted to withdraw any representation of Attribution from the ultimate text structure on a certain level, but this, although greatly simplifying the outline, can hardly be judged to contribute to a deeper understanding of the subtle interplay of the text's structural parts.

Below, I will introduce one concrete case of such troubleshooting in the example of a Japanese fiction text annotated. It is the same short piece of fiction that I already used in my paper [3], to which I refer for further details on the text – a short fiction [4]. This time, my entire attention will be given to Attribution relations in it.

I use many of the lists of available rhetorical relations in theory basics and annotation manuals [9], [12]. There is a great deal of discrepancies between the theories as to the exact scope of the nominations, for which I refer the reader to available overviews in [6]. Among those, Attribution, as a means of pointing at linguistic material in a text, that comes from a different source than the author, was seldom deemed worthy of a place on the list of Rhetorical relations [9]. Generally, the neglect may have been caused either by the indeterminacy of its contribution to the text structure, or by the wish to keep the tree of the relations most slim and clean. Even making allowance for Attributions, [15, P. 4] rules out I-quotes and indirect quotation (the content treated as a verb argument), [18], and partially [16, P. 249] limit annotated Attribution to clause bounds, [19] do not raise use of it in dialogue, [17], though stressing its importance, deals primarily with a rather limited case of Attribution construction in news texts.

Attribution, nevertheless, becomes more vital with some shift to viewing wider discourse events than predominantly newspaper texts that made the departure point for the PRT. It was supported for the case of discourse by [12] and figured among the relations explicitly added to the RST list [16, P. 248], also especially for Russian material [7], [17] provides for Attribution and its markers a separate place in statistics of connecting devices [16], discerning between Reported speech pattern, Lexical means, Indicative phrase and others.

[11] turn to Attribution structure in more detail, aiming at an automatic system of information extraction, including so-called opinion-mining, see also [5]. I will on the whole employ their 4-component attribution model proposed in [11, P. 3577], consisting of (1) Source (noun phrase, adjective, preposition phrase – assigning the quotation to the author herself, another, mixed, arbitrary, and, one may add, universal or irrelevant/unclear), (2) Cue (speech verb or derivative, also grammatical and/or graphic marker, such as inverted commas), (3) Content (in any form of representation, including direct and indirect quoted and effects thereof), and (4) Supplement (cue modifier, source of source, event specification, comments etc.).

Another important contribution here is the division between types of Attributional relations, see [1]: (1) Assertions, identifiable by ‘assertive predicates’, or ‘communication verbs’; (2) Beliefs using (modal) ‘propositional attitude verbs’, (3) Facts, apparently pertaining again more to mental activities, expressed by ‘factive and semi-factive verbs’, and (4) Eventualities pinned down by so-called verbs of influence (causing the addressee to act), verbs of commitment (commissives) and verbs of orientation (describing a mental stance towards a state of affairs, comprising both factual and non-factual predicates). This discrimination correlates quite well to the general line-up of Attribution markers in Japanese, of which, however, only a rather limited part is found in fictional prose.

Research methods and principles

In the bulk of annotated text (692 elementary discourse units) Attribution relations are by far not the most frequent, though considerable stretches of text are polyphonic, including exchange of direct quotes. Only a limited number of options in markers are available, mostly the quotation construction. For a left-branching, loosely S-O-V/O-S-V structure of Japanese the canonical way of attributing quotes would be an optional Source postposition for the Cue, comprising, beside a speech verb, a grammatical quotation marker TO. If one counts the (marked) borders of attributed speech in dialogue (and not the, say, graphic limits of each utterance recorded dialogue, which would be times bigger numbers), we find the prevailing of Content preceding – in 27 cases, of which 14 with quote marker TO (indirect speech – 3 of them), with Content following at 14, of which 1 with TO.

TO becomes indispensable in cases of so-called indirect speech, roughly conveying Content, though in the case of Japanese not only keeping but more often than not highlighting its grammar. Apparently, in fiction indirect speech is preferred in instances of exchange that the author means to defocus, mainly with secondary participants (Content as indirect quote in 9-11): ⑥⁸ BOKUNIN WA ODOROKI, ⁹ SORE WA IKENAI, ¹⁰ KOCHIRA NI WA IMADA NAN NO SHITAKU MO DEKITE INAI, ¹¹ BUDOO NO KISETSU MADE MATTE KURE, ¹² TO KOTAETA. = ⁸ *Shepherds were taken aback* ¹² *and replied that,* ⁹ *it just wouldn't do,* ¹⁰ *they weren't prepared yet,* ¹¹ *and whether he could wait till grape harvest.* Indeed, ‘the Greek choir is treated in the same way once again: ①²³ GUNSHUU WA, DOYOMEITA. ²⁴ APPARE. ²⁵ YURUSE, TO ²⁶ KUCHIGUCHI-NI WAMEITA. = ²³ *The crowd came into motion.* ²⁴ *Excellent!* ²⁵ *Free him!* – ²⁶ *shouted hundreds of mouths.*

Graphically an intermediate option exists in Japanese, of quotes closer to direct (that is, retaining features of ‘real’ speech, such as, among other, additive affixation) but not marked with quotation brackets. That is the case for Melos’s friend’s speech rendered by a messenger. Here we have indeed a rather advanced gradation for those slightly more or less worthy of (de)focusing: ⑨³⁵ OOSAMA GA, SANZAN ANO KATA O KARAKATTE MO, ³⁶ MEROSU WA KIMASU, ³⁷ TO DAKE KOTAE... = ³⁵ *The king continually ridicules him* ³⁷ *but he only goes on replying* – ³⁶ *Melos will return!..* Quite interestingly, here the friend is defocused not so much for his insignificance, but for the fact that his speech is in fact rendered by a third speaker. When he is given the chance to speak in the final par. 24, he is bestowed with regular quotation brackets alright.

There are, roughly half as frequent, entries with precedent Source/Cue, accompanied by little or no marking: ②⁶ ROOJI WA, ATARI O HABAKARU HIKUGOE DE, ⁷ WAZUKA KOTAETA. ⁸ "OO SAMA WA, HITO O KOROSHIMASU" = ⁶ *The old man, in a low voice fearful of the surroundings,* ⁷ *answered shortly.* ⁸ *‘The king is killing folks.’*

As in many languages, a cataphoric deixic item is possible, but absent here. I would deem it incompatible with the modifier WAZUKA, turning ②⁷ into a full-fledged discourse unit, as compared to a more technical remark-like KOO ITTA (cf. “...” – *fit-il*, typically inverted, in French). The lexical Cue KOTAETA is typical but not indispensable, even without graphic Cues such as inverted commas here, a certain breach of relevance relations would convince the hearer that the content of the following phrase belongs to a character’s (internal) speech. In fact, KOO ITTA does occur once. Other speech verbs marking a probability of a following quotation include AIGAN-SHITA – *implored*,

It remains an untrivial question whether to count mental activity in Attribution relations. Alongside passages centered on dialogue, this short piece of fiction also contains stretches of reflection, which divide into dual prose – the character’s thoughts and ‘objective’, ‘from-the-outside’ descriptions of what is taking place. This may fit less into some schemas proposed for dialogic discourse, but the general setting remains the same – these form two separate planes of narration, disserved by a manifest interface between, some amount of marking indispensable. Relevant proposals have been sounded before, such as dividing Attribution relations into Quotes and Thought Incorporation [13]. If dialogue falls into (1) and partly (4) in the Attributional relations above, here we deal with (2).

A difference with attributed speech is a practically equal preceding Content at 15 (6 with TO) and following at 14, since the text is basically arranged in such a way that conjoining phrases tend to be somehow logically connected. That holds particularly for the cases of the unmarked ‘inner speech’, but not limited to it. A switch from mental monologue to reality, as was mentioned, is still in some cases marked with TO, and accompanied by mental (attitude) verbs, mostly of the more technical type – as OMOU = *think*, NEGAU = *wish*, KANGAERU = *ponder*. Preceding Cue verbs are somewhat less frequent but semantically richer – as KAKUGO SURU = *be aware*.

Mind-world direction of the same interface, on the other hand, mostly passes unmarked, except for the breach in tense consequence (mental reality always in the present, and includes hypothetic and other modal expressions) – see the return in 16-17 below: ⑧¹⁴ CHOTTO HITONEMURI SHITE,¹⁵ SOREKARA SUGU-NI SHUPPATSU-SHIYOO,¹⁶ TO KANGAETA.¹⁷ SONO KORO NI WA, AME MO KOFURI NI NATTE IYOO. = ¹⁴ *I could take some sleep* ¹⁵ *and then leave at once*, ¹⁶ *he thought*. ¹⁷ *By then the rain's probably going to stop*. Generally, a far richer grammatical realization of mental reality, uninhibited by temporal, modal, or deixical constraints in the course of the narration, is indeed in itself a clear sign of this switch: ②⁴ MEROSU NO ASHI WA, HATATO, TOMATTA.⁵ MIYO, ZENPOO NO KAWA O. = ⁴ *Melos stopped in his track*. ⁵ *Just take a look at this river!* Modality includes evidentiality ⑥³ ...IKI O NONDE MIMI WO SUMASHITA.⁴ SUGU ASHIMOTO DE, MIZU GA NAGARETE IRU RASHII. = ³ *He held his breath pricking his ears*. ⁴ *Just under [his] feet there seems to be running water*. See for deixis, being the only marker of a switch to mental reality in 20-21, until some grammatical disorderliness, characteristic of spontaneous utterances, and final present tense take up some of the job – ⑩¹⁹ MEROSU WA HITAI NO ASE O KOBUSHI DE HARAI,²⁰ KOKO MADE KUREBA DAIJOBU,²¹ MOHAYA KOKYOO HE NO MIREN WA NAI = ¹⁹ *Melos wiped his forehead with his fist* – ²⁰ *coming to this point is already something*, ²¹ *there are no regrets left behind in the village*. ⑬²² MIGOTO = *wonderful!* and 24 ARIGATAI = (I am) *grateful* as lone assessment markers intersperse author's description of the hero's actions, creating a two-dimensional narrational space.

Thirdly, on a certain microlevel of structural analysis, a much wider scope of perceptual expressions may be seen in this way, as not only what we see or think, but also what we see indeed bears a stamp of the seer's individuality, see (3) in the list of Attribution relations. It is seen through the eyes of a hero that reality is depicted in prose of any psychological depth. A relevant Cue is, naturally, an expression of perception (Source), and a construction of consequence with a cognitive effect: ⑭⁵ YOROYORO OKIAGATTE,⁶ MIRU TO,⁷ IWA NO SAKEME KARA KONKONTO,⁸ NANIKA CHIISAKU SASAYAKINAGARA,⁹ SHIMIZU GA WAKIDETE IRU NO DE ARU. = ⁵ *He rose unsteadily* – ⁶ *to look at it*, [*and from here on we look at the thing with his eyes, in a way*] ⁷ *from a fissure in the rocks there's a fountain* ⁸ *quietly gurgling* (only finally the perceptive 'inlay' is corroborated by the mirative NO).

Now, breaking this relation down to units of discourse may be a challenging task: ⑰²⁵ MEROSU WA²⁶ MUNE NO HATISAKERU OMOI DE,²⁷ AKAKU OOKII^{25a} YUUHI BAKARI O MITSUMETE ITA = ²⁶ *His heart breaking in his chest*, ²⁵ *Melos kept his eyes on the sun*, ²⁷ *red and huge*. In this piece, it is not the grandeur of the scenery that the author is trying to impress us with, but its effect on Melos. 'Red and huge', in this contraption, becomes a quasi-quotation highlighting a complex emotional attitude of the hero, and enlivening the narration by the sheer sense of presence. It looks as if the whole subtlety of the effect, though, is balanced on the minimal amount of stressing it. Any more direct marking would surely destroy it – to an inquisitive annotator's distress.

Prose at its best volume, then, is achieved in masterly interweaving all the dimensions mentioned – descriptions, subjective perception, internal speech, and dialogue. In fact, straight after the fragment just quoted we can see a shift to Melos's internal speech, unmarked but for grammar and the present tense, and then starts a dialogue, marked purely graphically, in quotation brackets! ⑱²⁸ HASHIRU YORI HOKA WA NAI.²⁹ 'HASHIRU NO O YAMETE KUDASAI... = ²⁸ *There's no choice but to run*. ²⁹ *Please stop running...* We couldn't be unable to call such mixture of layers and levels a sort of multimedia writing.

Main results

All cases considered, a significant difficulty is orienting Attribution by the rhetoric weights of its components – a sine qua non for placing it in context both within a broader stretch of text and in the unified range of rhetorical relations. According to the Rhetoric Structure Theory, mononuclear relations comprise a more central and a more peripheral element. With Attributions, if one is led by the analogy with the Elaboration relation, then the attributor is the Nucleus, and the attributed content its Satellite. To tackle the problem from the point of view of the salience in discourse, this may be completely conformant to cases of the quotation illustrating an already clear type of reaction, such as 'he thanked' or 'she was furious'. In this, Attribution relations may well almost completely merge with the Elaboration kind, providing a ready argument for their expulsion from the annotator's list.

Another option how attribution constructions may be treated, is Generalization, the exact opposite of Elaboration. That is more appropriate in cases when remarks following lines of dialogue have a crucial input in the understanding of the scene, as is the case when a shift to a subjunctive mood in the Cue material actually transfers the whole utterance from spoken speech to the category of internal speech: ⑳⁶ TO OOGOE DE KEIJOO NO GUNSHUU NI MUKATTE SAKENDA TSUMORI DE ATTA GA⁷ NODO GA TSUBURETE ... = ⁶ *all of that he was about to shout to the throng at the execution grounds*, ⁷ *but his throat became stuck...* Now, as far as a more macro-level outlook is concerned, it would be logical to ascribe prevalence to that more salient fragment which is directly linked to the higher level of the text organization, that is, to the upper node in the discourse tree representing the speaker's plan. The problem is that in fiction prose conceiving such a plan is not by a long chalk so easy as in more practically oriented texts such as an editorial or even a love letter.

Now, with Content following Source/Cue material and ending with the quotation marker TO, we seem to face an assured case of elaboration, that is, an N-S sequence, the preceding phrase providing most of the semantic impact. So much indeed, that far more precisely it should be annotated as a case of Equivalence (to be exact, Illustration, perhaps). It is necessary to note that such reversal, the parcellated bit ending in TO, never occurs with author's remarks to direct speech, but inside speech of a character, depicting someone else's speech: ㉑²⁴ MURA NO HITOTACHI NI SHIRASETE KOI.²⁵ KEKKONSHIKI WA, ASU DA TO. = ²⁴ *Go tell the villagers*. ²⁵ *The wedding's tomorrow, that is*.

Illustration would be the best way to describe a relation with preceding, and informationally dominant Source phrase even without the TO: ㉒¹² DOTTO GUNSHUU NO AIDA NI, KANSEI GA OKOTTA.¹³ BANZAI, OOSAMA BANZAI'. = ¹² *Suddenly, a cry broke out from among the crowds*. ¹³ *Glory, glory to the king!* No quotation marks, again – one does not indeed record verbatim cries of the crowds, does one? Here, however, an element of superstructure is inmixed in the purely semantic

sequence, 'banzai' being one of those phrases that are conventionally expected at the end of a text or a large period of it – as is here with the end of an episode (what follows is actually more of a coda than continuation of the story).

A contrary example is that when the Source phrase contains Cue information that can be classified as Level-of-detail. As typically this fragment precedes the Content, a certain likelihood is noticed with introductory (always preceding) Elaborations as Commentaries (or Evaluations) – collapsible to evaluative adverbials (such as luckily, to my surprise etc): ⑩¹¹ ICHIDAN NO TABIBITO TO SATTO SURECHIGATTA SHUNKAN, ¹² FUKITSU-NA KAIWA O KOMINI NI HASANDA. ¹³ 'IMAGORO WA, ANO OTOKO MO, HARITSUKE NI KAKATTE IRU YO'. ¹⁴ AA, SONO OTOKO, SONO OTOKO NO TAME NI ¹⁵ WATASHI WA, IMA KONNA-NI HASHITTE IRU NO DA. = ¹¹ *Passing a group of travellers,* ¹² *he overheard a piece of ominous conversation.* ¹³ *'By now that fellow would also be up crucified'* ¹⁴ *Ah! But it is for the sake of that fellow that I have ran all this way!* Representing 12 as a satellite introduction to nucleus in 13 could yield either Contrast, or Conclusion (Cognitive Result, also tractable as Reformulation) 14-15, while temporal connection in 11-12 would still hold as a subsidiary. It is only the temporal sequence of 'passed-heard-realized' that would grow invisible for the overall representation, thus weakening the narrative structure of the text. And this is not the only example when positing a hierarchical relation in Attribution undermines an intuitively sequential nature of the narration.

Also, to get down to the microlevel of in-utterance structure instead, it becomes hard to bypass the impression that the speech verb in Clue position is not solely – nor even mainly – a generalization of elaborated Content. Rather, it fulfills a twofold function. Firstly, it marks a turn in the sequence of remarks by the character, thus fulfilling the structural task of setting up Participation Structure of text [14]. That function, kept up continuously throughout the exchanges, especially the long ones, is not at all the same sort of attribution we see in expository texts where it should be important to trace back sources of theoretical stances, approaches and points of view. Nevertheless, it is just as important from the point of view of the addressee's orientation in the proceedings described in the text – in that sense, quite up to the goal of conveying procedural meaning, such as is demanded of connective devices in relevance theory [2]. Secondly, it acts as a lowermost node in the tree to which a further elaboration (Level-of-detail, or Commentary) is tied up (in this example below, providing for an alternative annotation – after the double slash):

③⁹ "KONO TANTOO DE NANI O SURU TSUMORI DE ATTA KA. ¹⁰IE!" ¹¹BOOKUN DEIONISU WA SHIZUKA-NI, ¹²KEREDOMO IGAN O MOTTE TOITSUMETA. = ⁹ *'What did you mean to do with that knife?'* ¹⁰ *Do tell!'* ¹¹ *Tyrant Dionysos inquired quietly* ¹² *but threateningly.* // ¹¹ *Tyrant Dionysos inquired* ¹² *quietly* ¹³ *but threateningly.*

What kind of Level-of-detail information can be added in this way? Let us look at some examples - ③¹⁷ TO MEROSU WA WAZUBIREZUNI KOTAETA = *Melos answered fearlessly;* ²³TO MEROSU WA IKINARI TATTE HAMPATSU SHITA = *Melos suddenly rose up in protest,* ⁴¹ OO WA SATTO KAO O AGETE HOOJITA = *the king notified swiftly raising his face,* ⑥⁶ HASHIRINAGARA = *while running,* ②²⁰ KASURETA KOE DE SEIIPPAI-NI = *at the top of his lungs,* and so on. None of these additions do not open new vistas in the narrative, remaining, however useful, secondary cul-de-sacs, and therefore representable as Satellites. But then, another possibility represents a juncture to a more subtle or more decisive shift in setting, where the comment opens up a hub to a new dimension in the exchange, as in ⁵³ TO IIKAKETE ⁵⁴ MEROSU WA ASHIMOTO NI SHISEN O OTOSHI SHUNJI TAMERAI = ⁵³ *speaking so,* ⁵⁴ *Melos dropped his gaze and hesitated for a moment.* How would that be representable enlarging on a Satellite?

Furthermore, it is not impossible to imagine cases where the elaborated nucleus would be semantically quite detached from the Content of the quotation – the more so, the less of a speech verb in a strict sense it would be. Thus, a verb signifying psychological reaction would yield an ambiguous interpretation – either as a generalizer for the elaborated Content in 31-32 below, or else a Cause for a non-verbalized speech verb which only, in turn, would comprise the quote as its elaboration: ②³⁰ KIITE, MEROSU WA GEKIDO-SHITA [SOSHITE KOO ITTA]. ³¹ "AKIRETA OODA. ³² IKASHITE OKENU" = ³⁰ *On hearing that, Melos was furious [and so he said].* ³¹ *'Miserable king!'* ³² *He does not deserve to live!'*

Generally, in cases of this type, one could claim verbs of psychological states and reactions can be construed as metonym (enlarging upon verbal realization of such state). This stance is corroborated by further examples when non-verbal reactions, described in author's remarks, fill slots in the in-dialogue relations of Eliciting Response-Response, such as Melos's sister's sole reaction to his speech in ⑤²⁰ IMOOTO WA KAO O AKARAMETA = *His sister blushed.* In ④⁴⁰ again she merely nods silently after a long stretch of Melos' speech (22-39). Obviously, in that environment, girls weren't allowed much more as ways of answering. In a way, they are revenged by an ironical episode when Melos himself in the very final lines of the short novel made to turn purple in response to his nakedness being pointed out (action-against-speech pattern again, in the Exchange structure).

Discussion

Just to get away from the elaboration/generalization dichotomy, I can report cases where attributing fragments are actually inserted between fragments of the Content, notably by the self and same speaker. In this case more clearly, but technically in the equal sense as well, beside relation between attributed and attributing matter, relations within the Content stand to mind (below – between 18 and 20-21), - just as they do in dialogue in complete accordance with Shiffrin's Exchange structure: ③¹⁸ 'OMAE GA KA?' ¹⁹ OO WA, BINSHOO-SHITA. ²⁰ 'SHIKATA NO NAI YATSU JA. ²¹OMAE NI WA, WASHI NO KODOKU GA WAKARANU.' = ¹⁸ *'You?!'* ¹⁹ *The king grinned in disdain.* ²⁰ *'What tedious.* ²¹ *Have you any idea of my solitude?'*

In this, Exchange structure – relations counting as adjacency pairs, such as Question-Answer, or Eliciting Response and Response, can hold over even longer spans of commenting material (Source/Cue), e.g. 5 units, which is not at all a limit for a strongly anticipated continuation. With other less acutely tense pairs the situation may be different, calling for more supports or more frequent interventions – as with Cause, or Reformulating.

Exchange structure, needless to say, holds even before non-verbal reactions, which in turn need to be construed from this perspective, and not otherwise, as in 103-104 here: ③¹⁰⁰ 'HAHA. ¹⁰¹ INOCHI GA DAJI DATTARA, ¹⁰² OKURETE KOI. ¹⁰³ OMAE NO KOKORO WA, WAKATTE IRU ZO'. ¹⁰⁴ MEROSU WA KUCHIOSHIKU, JIDANDA FUNDA. ¹⁰⁵ MONO O

IITAKU NAKATTA. = ¹⁰⁰ *Ha-ha.* ¹⁰¹ *If life's dear to you,* ¹⁰² *come late.* ¹⁰³ *I can see through you.'* ¹⁰⁴ *Melos stood his ground mute.* ¹⁰⁵ *He had no wish to speak.* No sooner than with 105 (offered here as Justification for 104) it becomes possible to posit a Cause relation with a missing Generalization of what the king was saying in 100-103, connecting the circuit.

Seen in this light, attribution relations and their markers, including speech verbs, can be seen as part and parcel of corresponding taxonomy pertaining to rhetoric structure on the whole. Whatever the ultimate balance of their representation inside the taxonomy, whether or not there can be found a unified account of them positioned often contrarily in the tree structure – they do indeed contribute differently by each element to the communicational exchange, step-by-step-wise, and therefore are eligible for annotating and reviewing among other rhetorical relations. On the other hand, they seem, after all, to constitute a slightly separate plane, and there are limits to how they can reasonably be made consistent in terms of representing attribution relations linearly, or, for that matter, in a one-way branching tree.

Actually, annotating this text led me to picture its entire continuity as divisible into several layers. Continuous in themselves, they do not need to be taken up in the reader's field of vision in every single sentence. However, as in the mind of the characters, they do stretch unbroken. Say, for the entire exchange in the 3rd paragraph, the outline is as follows:

Table 1 - Polyphony in dialogue description
 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2023.40.16.1>

M elo s				16					22		24 - 25				34 - 35		37 - 38				48 - 52		55 - 60				65 - 66
Ki ng		9- 10				18		20 - 21			26 - 30		33				39 - 40		44 - 47				61		63 - 64		
aut ho r's re ma rks	1- 8		11 - 15		17		19			23		31 - 32		36			41 - 42				53 - 54			62			67

And so on. It can be seen as two simultaneously developing interfaces, shifts between which can, but do not necessarily need to be marked. The need for such marking arises out of the necessity to convey a nuance, a change in the ambience of the exchange. Note that the author may intervene by far not only to mark the changing turn, but also inside continuing elocution by one speaker. In any event, from the layout schematically ordered here, it stands out vividly that orientation between layers and dimensions of narrative may well be crucial for significant stretches of rhetoric structure in dialogue-rich fiction.

Break-offs between dialogue content and continuation of narration, such as in the end of Melos's talk with his sister in par. 5, are not marked in any way, but this is indeed a sort of connection too – as a default interface between planes of narration and dialogue. No Attribution is present here as such, nor needs to be, at all times. All in all, the proportion between author's intervention (pushing forward the narrative drive) and dialogue (following its own logic) vary greatly according to the type of situation described. Thus, in the opening of par. 19 dialogue unfolds in an unforeseen setting that demands much more comment (Cue) than a 'stable' exchange between, say, Melos and king previously mentioned. To keep every and each of such episodes on a double 'payroll' of dialogue-internal dialogue-external relations would hardly meet the need to differentiate between the types, wouldn't it? Besides, even this relatively high level of informativity in Source and Cue material can in fact be kept down or omitted, thus confirming the prevalence of Content in a stretched-out Attribution interface. For instance, no background information would be truly necessary in a radio show, where the hearers would be guided uniquely by the internal rhetoric relations in dialogue (underlined – Greeting-Question-Reply):

¹ 'AA, MEROSU SAMA' ² UMEKU YOO-NA KOE GA ³ KAZE TO TOMO NI ^{2A} KIKOETA. ⁴ 'DARE DA'. ⁵ MEROSU WA ⁶ HASHIRINAGARA ^{5A} TAZUNETA. ⁷ 'FUROSUTORATOSU DE GOZAIMASU... = ¹ '*Hey Melos*' – ² *a groaning voice came* ³ *carried by the wind.* ⁴ '*Who's there?*' ⁵ *Melos asked* ⁶ *still running.* ⁷ '*I am Philostratos...*

A competition for salience in the minds of the communicators, thus, is an important feature of this double-, triple-decked structure that I seem to fathom here. At times, it appears, the whole succession of Content phrases can 'go under' and Source/Cue 'come above', contrary to the example just shown. A prerequisite condition for this would be extensive 'abstract' description of the scenario in the speech verbs. A more natural option, though, would be the Content driving the narration forward, and remaining central to its development, garnished by author's remarks 'strung' to each successive element in the keynote structure of the dialogue.

Conclusion

In this tentative study I looked at a specific genre of text, which has so far been getting limited attention from the point of view of rhetorical structure study, at least in language of a structure similar to Japanese. It was all the more obvious how the issue of attributing significant fragments of text is difficult to solve along the lines of canonical methods in rhetorical structure annotation. Indeed, clearly establishing Attribution relations plays a vital role in various types of discourse, including not only narrative (as was our object), but also expository and even argumentative, with an obvious exemption for a more flat-structured descriptive [8]. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that primarily Attribution came more and more into view with a genre shift to spoken dialogue. But what must be said in generalization is that, especially enlarged, as I attempted in this paper, to an all-in account of verbal and mental activity, Attribution provides an in-text interface between registers, or regimes of speech, even better representable in the light of dialogical / narrational division [10]. It is in this way that a specific framework for annotating Attribution relations beside the RTP tree would need to be developed, sometimes, but not necessarily, coinciding with the tree.

As long as human beings carry mental reality in themselves, there is supposed to always be such biplaneity in this or that proportion in any depiction and report of the world in speech – the external and internal, with spoken speech serving only as a medium. Various means of expressing that interface should all be taken in consideration and re-ordered according to their contribution and value. For instance, Speech verbs in themselves, at par with grammatical and graphical markers act as connectives marking attribution relations, among other things conveying procedural meaning as to whose turn in a conversation is recorded. But that already constitutes an area of further research.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Рецензия

Сообщество рецензентов Международного научно-исследовательского журнала
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2023.40.16.2>

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

International Research Journal Reviewers Community
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2023.40.16.2>

Список литературы / References

1. Asher N. N. Logics of Conversation: Studies in Natural Language Processing / N. Asher N., A. Lascaridas — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. — 317 p.
2. Blakemore D. Meaning, Relevance, and Discourse: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Connectives. / D. Blakemore — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. — 212 p.
3. Chironov S.V. Cohesion and Connection — Japanese Data. / S.V. Chironov // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2022. — 5. — URL: <https://rulb.org/archive/5-33-2022-september/10.18454/RULB.2022.33.1> (accessed: 01.03.23).
4. 太宰治 / 太宰治 / 太宰治 / 太宰治 / 太宰治 / 太宰治 / 太宰治 / 太宰治 - 筑摩書房, 1975. — URL: https://www.aozora.gr.jp/cards/000035/files/1567_14913.html (アクセスされた: 01.03.23)

5. Ding X. A Holistic Lexicon-based Approach to Opinion Mining. / X. Ding, J. Liu, P. Yu // Proc. 1st ACM Int. Conf. on Web Search and Data Mining; — Shanghai: ACM, 2008.
6. Инькова О.Ю. Связность Текста: Мереологические отношения / О.Ю. Инькова — М.: Языки Славянской Культуры, 2019. — 377 с.
7. Литвиненко О.А. Описание структуры дискурса в рамках Теории Риторической Структуры: применение на русском материале. / О.А. Литвиненко // Труды Международного семинара «Диалог»; — Dubna: MGU, 2008. — с. 159-168.
8. Longacre P. Field Analysis of Discourse. / P. Longacre, S. Levinson // Current Trends in Textlinguistics; edited by W. Dressler — New York: de Gruyter, 1978. — p. 103-122.
9. Mann W.C. Rhetorical Structure Theory and Text Analysis. / W.C. Mann // Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-raising Text. — 1992. — 1. — p. 39-78.
10. Падучева Е.В. Семантические исследования. Семантика времени и вида в русском языке. Семантика нарратива / Е.В. Падучева — М.: Языки русской культуры, 1996. — 479 с.
11. Paret S. Annotating Attribution Relations: Towards an Italian Discourse Treebank. / S. Paret, I. Prodanof // Proceedings of the International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2010, 17-23 May 2010; — La Valetta: LREC, 2010.
12. Prasad R. Annotating attribution in the Penn Discourse TreeBank. / R. Prasad, N. Dinesh, A. Joshi et al. // Proceedings of the COLING/ACL Workshop on Sentiment and Subjectivity in Text; — LA: ACL, 2006. — p. 31–38.
13. Renkema J. The Texture of Discourse: Towards an Outline of Connectivity Theory / J. Renkema — Haag: John Benjamins, 2009. — 213 p.
14. Schiffrin D. Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning, and Context. / D. Schiffrin // The Handbook of Discourse Analysis; edited by D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. Hamilton — Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. — p. 54–75.
15. Stede M. Annotation Guidelines for Rhetorical Structure / M. Stede, D. Das — Potsdam: University of Potsdam and Simon Fraser University, 2017. — 56 p.
16. Stent A. Rhetorical Structure in Dialog. / A. Stent // INLG'2000 Proceedings of the First International Conference on Natural Language Generation. — 2000. — 1.
17. Toldova S. Rhetorical Relations Markers in Russian RST Treebank. / S. Toldova, D. Pisarevskaya, N. Ananyeva // Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Recent Advances in RST and Related Formalisms; — LA: ACL, 2017. — p. 29–33.
18. Wilson T. Annotating Attributions and Private States. / T. Wilson, J. Wiebe // Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Frontiers in Corpus Annotation II: Pie in the Sky; — Ann Arbor: Michigan, 2005.
19. Wolf F. Representing Discourse Coherence: A Corpus-based Study. / F. Wolf, E. Gibson // Computational Linguistics. — 2005. — 31. — p. 249-287.

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Asher N. N. Logics of Conversation: Studies in Natural Language Processing / N. Asher N., A. Lascaridas — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. — 317 p.
2. Blakemore D. Meaning, Relevance, and Discourse: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Connectives. / D. Blakemore — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. — 212 p.
3. Chironov S.V. Cohesion and Connection — Japanese Data. / S.V. Chironov // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. — 2022. — 5. — URL: <https://rulb.org/archive/5-33-2022-september/10.18454/RULB.2022.33.1> (accessed: 01.03.23).
4. Dazai O. Hashire, Merosu [Run, Melos!] / O. Dazai. — Chikuma shoboo, 1975. — URL: https://www.aozora.gr.jp/cards/000035/files/1567_14913.html (accessed: 01.03.23) [in Japanese]
5. Ding X. A Holistic Lexicon-based Approach to Opinion Mining. / X. Ding, J. Liu, P. Yu // Proc. 1st ACM Int. Conf. on Web Search and Data Mining; — Shanghai: ACM, 2008.
6. In'kova O.Yu. Svyaznost' Teksta: Mereologicheskie otnosheniya [Text Cohesion – Mereological Rhetorical Relations] / O.Yu. In'kova — М.: Yazy'ki Slavyanskoj Kul'tury', 2019. — 377 p. [in Russian]
7. Litvinenko O.A. Opisaniye struktury' diskursa v ramkax Teorii Ritoricheskoy Struktury': primeneniye na russkom materiale [Discourse Structure Description in RTS on Russian Material]. / O.A. Litvinenko // Proceedings of International Symposium "Dialogue"; — DUBNA: MGU, 2008. — p. 159-168. [in Russian]
8. Longacre P. Field Analysis of Discourse. / P. Longacre, S. Levinson // Current Trends in Textlinguistics; edited by W. Dressler — New York: de Gruyter, 1978. — p. 103-122.
9. Mann W.C. Rhetorical Structure Theory and Text Analysis. / W.C. Mann // Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-raising Text. — 1992. — 1. — p. 39-78.
10. Paducheva E.V. Semanticheskie issledovaniya. Semantika vremeni i vida v russkom yazy'ke. Semantika narrativa [Semantic Studies. Temporal and Aspectual Semantics in Russian. Semantics of Narration] / E.V. Paducheva — М.: Yazy'ki russkoj kul'tury', 1996. — 479 p. [in Russian]
11. Paret S. Annotating Attribution Relations: Towards an Italian Discourse Treebank. / S. Paret, I. Prodanof // Proceedings of the International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2010, 17-23 May 2010; — La Valetta: LREC, 2010.
12. Prasad R. Annotating attribution in the Penn Discourse TreeBank. / R. Prasad, N. Dinesh, A. Joshi et al. // Proceedings of the COLING/ACL Workshop on Sentiment and Subjectivity in Text; — LA: ACL, 2006. — p. 31–38.
13. Renkema J. The Texture of Discourse: Towards an Outline of Connectivity Theory / J. Renkema — Haag: John Benjamins, 2009. — 213 p.
14. Schiffrin D. Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning, and Context. / D. Schiffrin // The Handbook of Discourse Analysis; edited by D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. Hamilton — Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. — p. 54–75.

15. Stede M. Annotation Guidelines for Rhetorical Structure / M. Stede, D. Das — Potsdam: University of Potsdam and Simon Fraser University , 2017. — 56 p.
16. Stent A. Rhetorical Structure in Dialog. / A. Stent // INLG'2000 Proceedings of the First International Conference on Natural Language Generation. — 2000. — 1.
17. Toldova S. Rhetorical Relations Markers in Russian RST Treebank. / S. Toldova, D. Pisarevskaya, N. Ananyeva // Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Recent Advances in RST and Related Formalisms; — LA: ACLA, 2017. — p. 29–33.
18. Wilson T. Annotating Attributions and Private States. / T. Wilson, J. Wiebe // Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Frontiers in Corpus Annotation II: Pie in the Sky; — Ann Arbor: Michigan, 2005.
19. Wolf F. Representing Discourse Coherence: A Corpus-based Study. / F. Wolf, E. Gibson // Computational Linguistics. — 2005. — 31. — p. 249-287.