

*Miasoiedova S. V.,
Candidate of Philology Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages № 3
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University*

THE IMPORTANCE OF SUBJECTIVE AND MODAL COMPONENTS FOR THE VARIETIES OF THE ILLOCUTIVE MEANING FORMATION (ON THE EXAMPLE OF “AUTHORITATIVE DEMAND” CONSTRUCTIONS)

Summary. In the article the research of peculiarities of the semantic organization of the indirect imperative utterances of the modern English language has been made. The influence of the pragmatic factors and the role of subjective and modal components for different types of illocution have been studied. The analysis has revealed the subjective and modal components which help to create such kind of imperative meaning as “authoritative demand”.

Key words: indirect illocutive utterances, component structure, subjective and modal components, pragmatic factors.

Introduction. Like any other semantic meaning, the illocution – an act of speaking or writing which in itself effects the intended action – can be expressed not only directly, with the help of imperative verbs. Being communicated as an indirect utterance, it becomes more eloquent, gaining additional illocutive force.

The object of the research of this article is the semantic organization of an indirect illocutive utterance that has an imperative meaning.

Problems for Discussion. The analysis of illocution as a semantic category involves the study of those illocutive variations that are usually considered to be the different types of the imperative meaning. Although linguists usually admit that there are different variances of imperative utterances (e. g. order, request, advice etc.), however the question of their classification is rather controversial. In most linguistic descriptions, certain varieties of illocution are mentioned only as examples of the expression of a command. Some researchers try to systematize the main kinds of volitional relations according to their intensity (L.V. Berezhan), or concerning the motive of a speaker or an addressee to perform an action (L.V. Fomina), or depending on the relationship between the parties of communication and their relation to the action (A.P. Volodin, A.I. Belyaeva, M.F. Kosilova, V.S. Hrakovsky). However, the full range of imperative meaning variations hasn't been presented, and systematic description of the component structure of each of the varieties hasn't been made, so the study offered in this article may be regarded as actual and important.

Investigation. The component analysis of the illocutive utterances is based on the provision that illocutive modality is the kind of so-called “the modality of implementation”. The fact is that the situation expressed in such utterances is always unreal and it should be implemented into reality. Based on

the representation of a state of things as unreal forms a “great circle modal values, the meaning of which is pointing to a turnaround from unreality to reality, i. e. in the implementation of this state of affairs” [1, p. 79–80]. This is what makes the substance of “the modality of implementation”, which is a typical expression of illocution.

The meaning of an illocutive utterance, and therefore its component structure, is formed by a complex interaction of extralinguistic factors. Above all, it is the speaker's intention that is what he wants to achieve with his statement from the interlocutor – what actions he expects from him/her. The nature of the relationships of interlocutors is also relevant, these are such factors as equality/inequality of social roles, age and so on., i. e. features that contribute to a dominant position of one of the communicants and dependence of the other one. The fact which of the participants of the situation – the speaker or the hearer – is interested in performing the action is also important.

There are different situations that depend on the character of the communication the features of which may considerably affect the meaning of an illocutive utterance. Therefore, the study of the mechanisms of formation of a variety of the imperative meaning involves consideration of extra-linguistic factors.

During the semantic analysis of illocutive statements there have been defined the basic subjective and modal components the combination of which determine the nature of their semantics. Such modal meanings as unreality and voluntarism are obligatory and peremptory for these statements. Unreality characterizes certain things as not existing in reality but only in mind. Voluntarism is considered to be an indication of the will of the man aimed at action.

The unreality of an imperative utterance corresponds to the formation of the sense of individual subjective modal meanings, especially the meaning of possibility/impossibility desirability/undesirability, the need or lack of such need.

Desirability finds itself in illocutive statements as a necessity matching the request or the interests of the speaker or the hearer. Ability is a condition or means to carry out something. Necessity is an obligatory, binding action and the need for it.

With some of these subjective modal meanings the expression of certain types of imperativeness is associated: such as request, advice, requirements, etc. Besides each of these types of imperativeness interact with evaluation: based on meanings of an action or state of affairs, the speaker can convince the interlocutor to prove his/her feasibility and desirability.

Evaluation component is important for formation illocutive utterances like request, advice, instruction.

Important for the formation of varieties of illocutive utterance meaning is also such semantic component as an indication of the categorical/uncategorical motivation.

A categorical utterance is the one that does not imply objections and other interpretations rather than those belonging to the speaker.

The component of authorization is meaningful for certain kinds of imperative utterances: this is the reference to the reliable source of information in order to provide convincing advice, warnings (preventive judgments), prohibitions.

The expression of uncertainty, even doubt of the possibility of action, facilitates the functioning of the modality of implementation. Regarding that, the semantic structure of an illocutive utterance should include such component as persuasiveness. It creates the meaning of uncertainty regarding the implementation of the action.

At the same time the semantic structure of an imperative utterance is more complicated than a set of these components. The problem is in the fact that when the speaker tells exactly what he wants the hearer to do, the speaker's and hearer's interests do not always coincide.

Therefore, in order to implement his plans the speaker must prove the possibility, necessity or desirability of doing things, underline favorable/unfavorable consequences of its performance/failure and so on. That can serve as the motivation to act.

The analysis of indirect illocutive statements proved the importance of an evaluative component in creating some varieties of motivation: i. e. requests, advice, requirements. It was found that the operation of the motivations expressed in one of these varieties depends on the characteristics of speech situation that created them: the participants and character of their relationships as well as the attitude towards motivated action. These factors affect the component structure of illocutive utterance meaning in determining the specific features of each of its varieties.

Provided that an illocutive utterance is influenced by many extralinguistic factors, its structure can have a combination of several semantic components with only some of them to be mandatory for any illocution. Others form certain combinations thus creating a particular character of illocution. As it has been already mentioned, a characteristic feature of all the illocutive utterances is the presence in their semantic structure such components as "unreality" (which corresponds to the unreal modality of illocution) and "voluntarism" (as illocution is always the expression of someone's will). However the additional semantic components can either reinforce the main meaning or give it some other expression, as for example in case of the illocutive constructions with the meaning of "authoritative demand".

The decisive form of the will expression and the hearer's dependence from the speaker makes the illocutive constructions with the meaning of "authoritative demand" closer to those with the meaning of "order". But what differs the first ones from the last ones is the informal style of the relations of the speaker and hearer, which eliminates the categoriality of statements with the meaning of "order". Thus, the meaning "authoritative demand" is created by the combinations of such components as "unreality", "necessary"

and "noncategorical voluntarism". In this case the illocution has the nature of an informal order. For example:

"Manuel had passed the fish on his way up the road... Further along the quay two figures were approaching. They looked to be in their early thirties and were obviously tourists, Americans he would guess. Look at the poor thing, said the woman, stopping beside the fish... It ought to be thrown back" (S. Collins "Do You Speak English?").

As L.V. Fomina states, the difference of orders and authoritative demands is in the fact that the person who gives an order has some power over the addressee. And the person who demands knows that in that particular case and circumstances the addressee has to fulfill the demand. The basis for such opinion is a general belief about the rule of behavior in a relevant situation [2, p. 68].

So addressing the hearer with a demand, the speaker is convinced that he has some grounds which allow him to insist in realization his ideas by the hearer, as in the situation of communication of a father and his son: *"It is time to stop playing and clean your room now."*

The demand can also refer to the choice of an action rather than the action itself as in the situation of taking a child into the doctor's office: *"Do you want me to hold your hand, or do you want to go in by yourself?"*

The acceptance of this utterance as a demand is motivated by the necessity of the situation; however the situation of a choice is rather specific: it gives the child a sense of control over the situation, but leaves no question that the child is going into the office.

Informal character of illocution lets us use the "authoritative demand" constructions in the variety of situations; conversely the number of situations which make available the "order" constructions is much narrower. The right to order is given by a position. The right to demand is not the result of the social subordination: parents can demand particular behavior from their children (to wash their hands, to go to bed, to do homework); an owner can demand careful attitude to his property; the person who suspects a lie may demand the truth; the person who lent money may demand the return of the debt. In case of an official communication a boss orders; the subordinate person is to demand: for example in case when he thinks the boss' behavior is inappropriate or harmful for the atmosphere at a workplace; he also has a right to demand his work appreciation; salary increasing, work conditions changing etc. All these situations – both formal and informal – are similar in one respect: the speaker is sure that his demand is fare.

The basis for a demand can be the fact of mistaken, harmful or even criminal behavior of the hearer. Then the speaker seeks to avoid the negative effect of his interlocutor behavior, as in the example: *"If you have the slightest regard for my wishes, said the girl, firmly, you will remain at this bench for ten minutes after I have left. I do not mean to accuse you, but you are probably aware that autos generally bear the monogram of their owner. Again, good-night" (O'Henry "While the Auto Waits").*

In this case, the combination of the components "necessity" and "voluntarism" create the meaning of the authoritative demand.

Unlike the situation of giving an order that doesn't suppose any objections from the side of the addressee, the situation

when the speaker demands something from the hearer often needs commenting on the demand by the speaker, motivating his actions or behavior. Such commentary in the context of the authoritative demand serves as an explanation of reasons for the demand to the hearer, and sometimes can be a warning, a caution, a reproach, or even a threat or an accusation. A commentary like that is called upon to form a motivation to perform an action.

An example of a commentary explanation can be found in the text with an illocutive utterance: *"Vusi, said the girl, the fish do not stay in the dry season. What if the bus comes when there are no fish? How will I feed the passengers? You must build a dam in the river"* (Ursula Wills-Jones *"Vusi Makusi"*).

The reason to build a dam in the river is explained in a warning "The fish do not stay in the dry season. What if the bus comes when there are no fish? How will I feed the passengers?"

The commentary that has a form of a threat is found in the context of the following authoritative demand: *"You shan't have any dinner till you've confessed everything", she (the mother) stormed.* (Saki *"Shock Tactic"*).

If the hearers ignore the action caused by the speaker (confess everything), it can lead to the anger of the hearer's mother who wishes the best fortune for her son. That's why the speaker threatens and warns at the same time; all this makes the demand authoritative.

An effective form to influence the interlocutor is the accusation. Accusing someone, the speaker tries to make the hear do according to his wish, for example: *"Do you know that fish is dying?" Manuel heard her ask. The boy looked up at her blankly and then shook his head. "Dying", she repeated, drawing out each syllable, but the boy remained dumb, uncomprehending..."* (S.Collings *"Do You Speak English?"*).

From the story we know that the speaker argues strongly against cruelty towards animals in general and the fish the boy caught in particular. She accuses the boy in the killing of a fish in this way demanding particular actions from the boy.

Accusation makes the hearer to change the behavior and act accordingly.

Reference to the aim pursued by the speaker in conjunction with the motivation can facilitate the creation of authoritative demand meaning: *"Well, I think the model should have a percentage", cried Hughie, laughing; "they work quite as hard as you do"* (O. Wilde *"The Model Millionaire"*).

The informing about the purpose – getting money for the job – and the motivation – "models work very hard" – serves the expression of the authoritative demand.

So, the meaning of the authoritative demand is the feature of the utterances with such semantic components as "unreality", particularly "necessity" and "voluntarism". They function in the situations of informal communication characterized by the dependence of the hearer from the speaker. The intonation can be either neutral or meaningful, categorical.

Conclusions and Perspectives. Thus, each imperative meaning is formed by a particular combination of subjective and modal meanings. The analysis has proved that components which are necessary for an illocutive utterance are "voluntarism" and "unreality". Unreality of an utterance is provided for by one of the subjective and modal meanings like possibility, desirability, necessity which facilitate the differentiation of distinct varieties of the imperative meaning. Each of these meanings interacts with special evaluation of actions, processes, situations forming an important element of illocution.

References:

1. Шмелева Т.В. Смысловая организация предложения и проблема модальности / Т.В. Шмелева // Актуальные проблемы русского синтаксиса. – М. : Изд-во Московского ун-та, 1984. – С. 78–101.
2. Фоміна Л.В. Комунікативна організація безсполучникового складного речення спонукального типу : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук / Л.В. Фоміна. – Х., 2000. – 18 с.

Мясоедова С. В. Вплив суб'єктивно-модального компонентного складу висловлення на формування відтінків спонукального значення (на прикладі висловлень зі значенням "настійна вимога")

Анотація. У статті проведено аналіз семантичної структури непрямих спонукальних висловлювань сучасної англійської мови. З'ясовано вплив прагматичних чинників та досліджено роль суб'єктивно-модальних компонентів на формування окремих різновидів спонукального значення. Встановлено, які саме суб'єктивно-модальні компоненти беруть участь у формуванні такого відтінку спонукального значення, як «настійна вимога».

Ключові слова: непрямі спонукальні висловлення, компонентний склад, суб'єктивно-модальні компоненти, прагматичні чинники.

Мясоедова С. В. Влияние субъективно-модального компонентного состава высказывания на формирование оттенков побудительного значения (на примере высказываний со значением «настоятельное требование»)

Аннотация. В статье проведен анализ семантической структуры косвенных побудительных высказываний современного английского языка. Выявлено влияние прагматических факторов и исследована роль субъективно-модальных компонентов на формирование отдельных разновидностей побудительного значения. Установлено, какие именно субъективно-модальные компоненты участвуют в формировании такого оттенка побуждения, как «настоятельное требование».

Ключевые слова: косвенные побудительные высказывания, компонентный состав, субъективно-модальные компоненты, прагматические факторы.