ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

E. Postevaya
Don state technical university
Rostov-on-Don, Russia
katrin-21cent@mail.ru

DIALOGICAL TEXT INTERACTIONAL ANALYSIS: INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS AND THEIR FUNCTIONING

[*Постевая Е.В.* Интерактивный анализ диалогического текста: косвенные речевые акты и их функционирование]

It is proved in the article that indirect imperative and commissive acts display in the dialogic speech such pragmatic characteristics as (1) reflecting intensive positive or negative emotions (not manifesting explicitly feelings experienced by the speaker while initiating the speech act) in the aspect of covering a particular situation; (2) parameterization based on the degree of the emotional state experienced by the speaker; (3) manifesting a kind of deviation from the norm of the object evaluated and the speaker's excessive emotional activity, losing the control over himself / herself, uncontrollable emotional outburst what potentially finds a clear reflection in the propositional content of the speech act initiated. Transposition of the indirect imperative and commissive acts into the indirect expressive acts is realized based on the communicative introductor initiated into the dialogic utterance structure. The discursive and semantic structure of the speech acts analyzed in the article detects such components as (1) imperative or commissive illocution functioning as the generating base of the indirect speech act; (2) expressive illocution which is actualized in the context of the interlocutors' current speech interaction.

Keywords: dialogic communication, dialogic text, indirect speech act, emotions, transposition, proposition, illocution.

Speech communication is a process of intentional impact on the interlocutor's cognitive thinking with the aim of creating the mutual psychological comfort atmosphere. This kind of impact could be both intensified and soft-focus, therefore the speaking person chooses this or that speech genre, faces with the response – speech or non-speech – reactions, which complicate or facilitate achieving the pre-marked goals [5, 6, 8]. This aspect is of particular importance for investigating the language tools through which the communicative partners show their real intentions to each other, express consent or disagreement with the opponent's verbal behavior. The pragmatic nature of the addresser's language design intentions largely determines the perspectives of the developing dialogical interaction, its rationality

for both interlocutors [11]. Obviously, this kind of pragmatic nature could not be formed with – in terms of methods of expressing – strictly homogeneous elements, particularly in the dialogical situation where the partners pursue opposite aims and occupy different positions in the social hierarchy.

These extra-linguistic factors of dialogical communicative process often determine the speech way of manifesting the intentions, different degrees of their explicitness [9, 10]. As the consequence, in real dialogical communication practice the interlocutors initiate the indirect speech acts, the illocutions of which are formed and expressed with peripheral way speech actualization of functional and semantic categories. In its speech level the indirect impact representation is implemented as the semantic dissonance between the form and content of dialogical utterance [2, 3, 4]. The utterance acquires additional semantic augmentation, begins to serve as an effective way of attracting the interlocutor's attention to the necessity of complying with the addresser's communication step which has been previously initiated. Thus, the peripheral way speech actualization of functional and semantic categories entails the dissention between the utterance language and speech meanings: the softened language tools realize the intensified speech impact. Therefore, the indirect speech act functional aspect affects such interactional sphere as emotional and evaluative speech components. In the spontaneous dialogical speech the interlocutors' attention to the context of such utterances is manifested with the richness of linguistic tools served for emotion expressing in striving to convey different shades of feelings occurred between the interlocutors [1, 7].

In the dialogical communication the initial indirect speech act replica is designed to foster the response emotions and estimations that should be the same as currently experienced by the speaker [12, p. 73]. Assertive speech acts as a peripheral way of expressing the imperativeness in the spontaneous dialogical speech are frequently used. Our observations reveal that assertive replicas expressing subjectively determined imperative meaning, as a rule, contain the negative evaluation of the addressee's current state of affairs. Cf.:

(1) *" – **Niepotrzebnie robi pan te wszystkie zastrzeżenia**. Pańskie pragnienie jest zupełnie zrozumiałe. Bartek musiał przyznać, że nie tego się spodziewał... " (J. Seipp. Królewna).*

The subjective negative evaluation enhances the replica prescriptive meaning. In the addresser's opinion, the following presumption is to be activated: the recipi-

ent will consciously change the state of affairs which does not deserve the positive estimation. In prognosticating the expected speech reaction the initiator of indirect imperative act comes from the absolutized estimation of his personal position, takes into account only those conditions which he considers to be important for him. The speaker recognizes this arrangement as the interaction semantic focus. At the same time this indirect speech act appears to be the pragmatic way of expressing the speaker's current emotive state (censure, annoyance). In other words, the peripheral ways of expressing functional and semantic category analysis could give an investigative chance for defining the correlation between the indirect act semantic structure and the characteristics of the speaker's psychological current state.

The interrogative utterances which also reinforce the communication with both positive and negative emotions are considered to be quite productive actions transposing into the pragmatic sphere of indirect imperative acts. Cf.:

(2) *"– **Dlaczego mnie zwodzisz? Dlaczego nie przyznasz się, że jesteś Amosem i wiesz o mnie wszystko?** – Nie jestem żadnym Amosem. Nazywam się Andzej Mos"* (O. Tokarczuk. Don dzienny, dom nocny).

In pragmatic terms such interrogative utterances could be regarded as prohibitive and expressive speech acts. The indirect sense of the underlined utterances is formed by two their meanings: firstly, planning the changes in the listener's behavior (*Nie zwodz mnie! Przyznaj się!*); secondly, inoculating the recipient with the emotions currently experienced by the speaker. And in this dialogical communication the listener does not maintain the dialogue initiator's communicative strategy, therefore, deliberately ignores indirect illocution of the interrogative utterance and reacts to its primary (actual interrogative) meaning. In line with the second meaning the empathy focus emerges in the utterance, i.e. identifying the speaker with the recipient, the participant or the object of the reported event. Depending on the specific conditions of the current communicative process the actualization of one of these meanings could be more explicit, the actualization of other meaning could be less explicit. Their intersection, neutralization or mutual positive resonance is also theoretically possible. Everything depends on the degree of restrictions imposed by the socio-cultural conditions upon the dialogical communication.

Thus, the peripheral way speech actualization of functional and semantic categories in dialogical communication is accompanied, as a rule, with additional emotional and evaluative components, which makes this actualization an effective

means of appeal to the recipient's cognitive and volitional spheres. Imperativeness expressed with the utterances non-imperative in the form takes their impact into the recipient's world of knowledge and feelings, i.e. ultimately affects the recipient's modus. At the same time, such forms of will expressing give the speaker a chance "to pragmatisize" both his / her Self and Other(s) in the current communicative act. The recipient factor makes the speaker properly organize the pragmatic structure of his / her dialogical replica.

The speaker solves communicative specific tasks within the sphere of interpersonal relationships, and therefore all of the indirect speech acts are always addressed. Speaker's applying to the indirect speech tactics might either meet the recipient's interests or be harmful to the recipient. In the first case the addresser does not dare to speak openly about his / her intentions, implementing of which might impede the interlocutor's actions (for example, expressing the proposal through indirect interrogative utterance); in the second case the speaker refuses to directly express his / her intention, as he believes his communicative task to be reprehensible (for example, when generating utterances with the meaning of threat where the role relationships between interlocutors play an important role). But in these and those circumstances the primary plan of interlocutors' speech behavior includes a commitment to support the current communication, i.e. utterance phatic function which is in general an important feature of imperative speech highlights in the dialogical communication.

The speaker corrects his / her dialogical utterances in accordance with the external manifestation of the recipient's response to the previously made impact, pragmatic and cognitive reasoning for this response [12, p. 135]. We consider the communicative function of addressing as a macro-function, inside of which there are several components associated with such functional types of addressing as appellative, phatic / contact, characterizing, emotive, appellative-describing. The speaker's replica is aimed at achieving the mutual understanding with the recipient and appears to be the bearer of several above-mentioned functions.

The investigation of actually commisive speech acts realization conditions displayed that they are functioning as the means of achieving various social aims depending from their pragmatic contexts which are revealed on the basis of the following criteria:

1. affiliation of illocutive indicators either to proactive or reactive interlocutor;
2. motivation character;

3. utterance ultimate purpose;

4. dialogue pragmatic structure.

The communication involving commissives is realized in two types of pragmatic contexts: 1) the mandatory assistance context and 2) the pre-contract and contract commitment context. In the context of the first type the commissives according to their perlocutive parameter could be used in two ways: to cause expectation and additionally 1) convincing of the intention sincerity and 2) calming down / convincing not to worry.

The commitment-assistance context is typical for the situation of «prompting – adoption of the action» where the initiative interlocutor with a directive speech act expresses interest in the action sought and the addressee fixates his / her attitude to the directive act with the help of commissive means (the requested commitment). Sometimes in structural terms the commissive means are used initiatively (the non-requested commitment). In this case the interlocutor making a commitment presupposes or knows about the partner's wish relative to performing the corresponding action. From the point of view of interlocutors' behavior motivational conditionality this kind of situation could also be related to the commitment – assistance context. As an illustration we'll display the commissives functioning as a promise and oath in the commitment-assistance context.

The promise having paradigm organizing status in the commissives system is represented in the commitment-assistance context with the following subtypes:

1. neutral promise;

2. promise-assurance;

3. promise-concession.

The neutral promise as well as promise-assurance could be both requested and non-requested. The promise-concession is always requested.

The following dialogue chunk between a dad and his son contains the son's requested neutral promise, exactly a promise in reply to the dad's request-moralizing note:

(3) *"Mr. Shaw: Good-bye, love, and a bit less of that joking. Andrew: Aye, aye, I promise that. Good-bye, Dad…" (Storey D. In Celebration).*

The non-requested neutral promise as a reaction to a more or less wide situation which semantically condensing becomes the presupposition defining the dialogic actualization of taking a commitment is represented in the example (2). Rear-

don, the Shows' neighbor, requests a permission to pay a visit to them knowing that Mr. and Mrs. Show's sons are leaving in the morning and presupposing that there will be a chance to cancel the departure:

(4) *"Reardon: I shall pop in, if I may, in the morning, and say my farewells. Andrew: Aye, We'll have one more before we go. Reardon: Now there's a promise I'll not forget…" (Storey D. In Celebration).*

The aim of the promise-assurance is to convince the interlocutor in the sincerity of one's intention of committing the future action. The assurance in fulfilling the future action is the promise which is aimed simultaneously at changing the interlocutor's current emotional and psychological state that is doubts in speaker's sincerity, disturbance, emotional arousal, resentment, grievance and disappointment. In the initiative replica of the example (3) we witness the elements of doubts in the fact that after the parting Emily, George's beloved girl, will remember about him and write letters to him. This is certified by both the interrogative request construction and the clause of condition which predetermines the reactive requested promise-assurance:

(5) *"George: Emily, if I go away to State Agriculture College next year, will you write me a letter once in a while? Emily: I certainly will. I certainly will, George…" (Wilder T. Our Town).*

The promise-concession occupies the intermediate position between the commitment-assistance context and the pre-contract and contract commitment context. With the first context type it is connected through the concession semantics as the commitment-assistance. This subtype of promise indeed functions in the conditions when initiative interlocutor persuades the addressee that he / she should fulfill the action in his / her interests. On persuading the addressee the interlocutor is eager to secure the addressee's commitment. The example (4) represents the dialogue chunk which contains a demand not to fulfill an action expressed with *to be to*, an equivalent of the modal verb *must*, and a request about a promise. The reactive interlocutor goes on concession and males a promise:

(6) *"Anite: Norman, look. I'm going to say something. But you're not to look at me while I'm saying it… do you promise?.. Norman: …Won't look… (Ayckbourn A. Round and Round the Garden).*

The oath is a solemn taking commitment which fulfills the pragmatic functions similar with the promise and differs from the promise by its semantic load. In the commitment-assistance context the oath is represented with the following sub-

types: 1) oath promise-assurance; 2) oath promise-concession; 3) mutual oath. For example, the oath promise-assurance follows the answers on the initiative replicas which in addition to imperative semantics contain the semantics of doubt, disturbance, distrust and mild rebuke. Cf.:

(7) *"Lady C.: ... Come back once more, you promised! John: I'll come back. I swear it" (S. Beauman. Dark Angel).*

In the pre-contract and contract commitment context the promise is used by an asking non-authoritarian person who in case of refusal, hesitation, doubts or with preventive aims reinforces his / her request with condition-commitment, the basic purpose of which is to interest the interlocutor in committing the action requested, that is to strike a balance of mutual interests. This is the situation of persuading / convincing, but of the pre-contract or contract type. In the example (6) the utterance with the verb *promise* which accompanies Dangerfield's request to lend him money is interpreted as a conventional promise with the reasoning to provide debt return in the precisely specified time. The request about the promise is implicit in this case, but it is conventionally presupposed. That is why the asking interlocutor declares about it himself. Cf.:

(8) *"Dangerfield: Look, Kenneth, I know this is rather an impromptu request, but could you possibly let me have ten quid. O'Keffe: I'm getting out of here. Dangerfield: Beg you, Kenneth, stay. Don't let me drive you like this out of my little oasis of refreshment and joy. Kenneth, ten quid, promise to have it to you in four days, be right here when you arrive. No questions about that. Airtight loan. My father's sending me a hundred quid Tuesday..." (King F. The Firewalkers).*

The observation of the speech act realization conditions in such important communication sphere as guaranteeing the fulfillment of the future action with the application of interactional parameter displays that the commissives in the commitment-assistance context function as real commitments, and in the pre-contract and contract commitment context as conditional commitments. Thus, different pragmatic contexts define their different semantics. The interactional analysis also states that commissive illocutionary acts are the means of achieving social and communicative aim of convincing. Real commitments are taken for convincing intention sincerity, conditional commitments are taken for persuading that the interlocutor should do something.

R E F E R E N C E S

1. *Azarova O.A., Kudryashov I.A.* Cognitive approach to implicit knowledge investigation // Cognitive language investigations. 2015. № 21.

2. *Golovinova P.A., Kudryashov I.A.* Indirect speech acts with communicative introductory: semantics and functioning in the dialogic speech // Language and law: actual problems of interaction. Rostov-on-Don, 2015.

3. *Golovinova P.A., Kudryashov I.A.* Indirect expressive act as the reflection of speaker's emotional experience in dialogic interaction // In the world of scientific discoveries. 2015. № 11.2 (71).

4. *Golovinova P.A., Kudryashov I.A.* The problem of differentiating direct and indirect expressive acts in the aspect of informative and illocutive module correlation // Scientists' Eurisian Union. 2015. № 10–3 (19).

5. *Klemenova E.N., Kudryashov I.A.* Dialogic movement in contemporary linguistics: personality pragmatic investigation in informative society // Social and cultural spheres and communicative strategies of informative society. SPb, 2015.

6. *Komissarova M.S., Kudryashov I.A.* The problem of interlocutors' speech competence in dialogic interaction // Language and law: actual problems of interaction. Rostov-on-Don, 2015.

7. *Kotova N.S., Kudryashov I.A.* Interlocutors' epistemic status and evidential means of its manifestation in dialogic interaction // In the world of scientific discoveries. 2015. № 11.2 (71).

8. *Kotova N.S., Kudryashov I.A.* Linguophilosophical pragmatics VS. cognitive pragmatics: two views on the same problem // Cognitive language investigations. 2016. № 25.

9. *Kudryashov I.A.* Phenomenon of communicative freedom in oral and written discourse: abstract of thesis. Rostov-on-Don, 2005.

10. *Kudryashov I.A., Golovinova P.A.* Categorization problem of emotional state dialogic speech subject in contemporary linguistics // Humanitarian scientific investigations. 2015. № 12 (52).

11. *Kudryashov I.A., Klemenova E.N.* M.M. Bakhtin's pedagogies and the methods of higher education methods // Contemporary investigations of social problems. 2016. № 3 (59).

12.*Kudryashov I.A., Makova T.A*. Indirect commissive act as a reaction to imperative stimulus in the dialogue // Language and law: actual problems of interaction. Rostov-on-Don, 2013.

Л И Т Е Р А Т У Р А

1. *Азарова О.А., Кудряшов И.А*. Когнитивный подход к исследованию неявного знания // Когнитивные исследования языка. 2015. № 21.

2. *Головинова П.А., Кудряшов И.А*. Косвенные экспрессивные акты с коммуникативным интродуктором: семантика и функционирование в диалогической речи // Язык и право: актуальные проблемы взаимодействия: Материалы V–ой Международной научно-практической конференции. Ростов-на-Дону, 2015.

3. *Головинова П.А., Кудряшов И.А*. Косвенный экспрессивный акт как отражение эмоционального опыта говорящего субъекта в диалогическом взаимодействии // В мире научных открытий. 2015. № 11.2 (71).

4. *Головинова П.А., Кудряшов И.А*. Проблема дифференциации прямых и косвенных экспрессивных актов в аспекте соотношения информационного и иллокутивного модулей // Евразийский союз ученых. 2015. № 10-3 (19).

5. *Клеменова Е.Н., Кудряшов И.А*. Диалогическое движение в современной лингвистике: прагматическое исследование личности в информационном обществе // Социокультурные среды и коммуникативные стратегии информационного общества: Труды Международной научно-теоретической конференции. СПб, 2015.

6. *Кудряшов И.А., Клеменова Е.Н*. Диалогическая педагогика М.М. Бахтина и методы вузовского обучения // Современные исследования социальных проблем (электронный научный журнал). 2016. № 3 (59).

7. *Комиссарова М.С., Кудряшов И.А*. Проблема речевой компетенции собеседников в диалогическом взаимодействии // Язык и право: актуальные проблемы взаимодействия: Материалы V–ой Международной научно-практической конференции. Ростов-на-Дону, 2015.

8. *Котова Н.С., Кудряшов И.А*. Эпистемический статус собеседников и эвиденциальные средства его манифестации в диалогическом взаимодействии // В мире научных открытий. 2015. № 11.2 (71).

9. *Котова Н.С., Кудряшов И.А*. Лингвофилософская прагматика vs когнитивная прагматика: два взгляда на одну и ту же проблему // Когнитивные исследования языка. 2016. № 25.

10. *Кудряшов И.А*. Феномен коммуникативной свободы в устном и письменном дискурсе: автореф. дис. … докт. филол. наук. Ростов-на-Дону, 2005.

11. *Кудряшов И.А., Головинова П.А.* Проблема категоризации эмоционального состояния субъекта диалогической речи в современной лингвистике // Гуманитарные научные исследования. 2015. № 12 (52).

12. *Кудряшов И.А., Макова Т.А.* Косвенный комиссивный акт как реакция на побудительный стимул в диалоге // Язык и право: актуальные проблемы взаимодействия: Материалы III-й Международной научно-практической конференции. Ростов-на-Дону, 2013.

6 декабря 2016 г.