

*Oleinikova G. O.,**Associate Professor, PhD in Philology,
Associate Professor at the English Philology and World Literature Department
Izmail State University of Humanities**Slobodiak S. I.,**Lecturer at the English Philology and World Literature Department
Izmail State University of Humanities*

ON THE IMPERATIVENESS CATEGORY IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE COMMUNICATION (THE CASE STUDY OF THE SPEECH ACT OF PROHIBITION IN FICTION)

Summary. This study examines imperativeness as a functional and semantic category reflecting the relation of the speaker's speech to the realities of life. The imperative nature of this category is based on its verbal and morphological form to be used to set up the communication process. Considering imperativeness as a category makes it possible to single out its communicative and pragmatic properties, which are manifested in interpersonal relations of all the participants of communication. In the course of this research, imperative speech acts of prohibition have been analyzed according to seven criteria: the communicative goal, the author's concept, the addressee's concept, the content of the event, the factor of the communicative past, the factor of the communicative future, the linguistic implementation. It has been found that the communicative goal of the speech act of prohibition is to force the addressee to stop performing a certain action that is unacceptable from the speaker's point of view, or to prevent such an action in the future. The author of the prohibition can be a person of higher social status, authority, who is personally interested in ensuring that the interlocutor does not perform some action. The addressee is a person with limited or equal communication rights in relation to the interlocutor. The prohibition acts both as an initial and as a reactive speech act. The prohibition is reactive when it is preceded by verbal actions that the speaker considers unacceptable for himself and they do not meet moral, ethical and aesthetic norms. In case of unsuccessful implementation of prohibition, there may follow the acts that demonstrate a strict strategic line of behaviour. The key linguistic means of imperative speech acts of prohibition are the grammatical structures of the negative imperative, which are often used to denote a prohibited action. Prohibition can also be implemented by using different modal verbs in their negative forms, phase verbs, negative pronouns and adverbs. There have been cases of using emphatic and polite etiquette imperative formulas of prohibition to emphasize the alienated and cool attitude of the speaker, who seeks to achieve his goal without resorting to unnecessary insults of the addressee.

Key words: imperativeness, imperative structures, speech acts of prohibition, communicative goal, author's concept, addressee's concept, content of the event, factor of the communicative past, factor of the communicative future, linguistic implementation.

Problem statement. At the current stage of the linguistic research development there are a number of works on linguistics

devoted to the problem of studying the structural and morphological, functional and semantic aspects of imperative constructions, which express the intention of the speaker to force the listener to perform a certain action. But the world linguistic community has already reoriented itself towards the discursive study of linguistic phenomena, and more often linguists are talking about the need to turn to the study of the language code in the process of communication. Therefore, it is important to consider the problems of the interaction of participants of communication, aimed at the regulation of interpersonal relations. In this regard, the task of systematizing the means of expressing imperativeness in the English language, as well as identifying its certain models that construct the corresponding types of syntactic structures, bringing them to the level of speech acts aimed both at achieving tolerance and at initiating confrontation, is particularly promising.

Recent publications overview. Recently, the focus of researchers' attention has been shifted from the systemic and structural aspects of language to the functioning of language as a means of communication. As A. D. Bielova admits, this has happened because "the descriptive systemic and linguistic approach, which earlier gave positive results, now does not have sufficient explanatory power to solve the task of comprehensive study of dialogue as a product of linguistic activities" [1, p. 11]. Nowadays, scientists try to study language from an anthropocentric perspective. O. L. Biessonova defines the anthropocentric approach to language as a comprehensive study of linguistic means used in certain communicative situations, taking into account psychological, scientific and cultural factors in the analysis of the communication process, identifying the degree of effectiveness of using different linguistic means in specific communicative conditions [2]. As for the imperative structures, I. A. Bekhta states that scientists have begun to consider imperativeness as a category in which the communicative and pragmatic function of language is particularly vivid [3, p. 77].

A large number of works are now devoted to imperative speech acts, imperative situations, communicators in these situations [4; 5; 6]. The majority of them are connected with the theory of speech acts by J. Austin and J. Searle, who drew attention to the pragmatic nature of human speech. They suggested dividing the process of "speaking" into three constituent parts: the illocutionary act as the intention of the speaker; the locative act as the actual speech; the perlocutionary act as a deliberate effect of communica-

tion [7, 8]. But as the basis for our analysis of the communicative and pragmatic features of the use of imperative structures, we take the "questionnaire of the act", proposed by V. B. Burbelo in order to present the main pragmatic and linguistic characteristics of speech acts. Having formulated a fair thesis that a speech act is a comprehensive model, the scientist considers the construction of speech act characteristics according to seven criteria: the communicative goal, the author's concept, the addressee's concept, the content of the event, the factor of the communicative past, the factor of the communicative future, the linguistic implementation. In other words, "the speech act is determined by *who, to whom, why, about what and how* he speaks, taking into account *what happened and what will happen* later in communication" [9, p. 63].

The purpose of this article is to consider the lexical and grammatical features of the use of imperative structures with further identification of their communicative and pragmatic characteristics in the process of the realization of the speech act of prohibition in the English language fiction works.

Main research material presentation. In the situation of prohibition, the person who has the right and the authority to do so can realize the speech act of prohibition. The prohibition can be expressed both in an official and in an informal setting. *The communicative goal* of prohibition is to force the addressee to stop performing a certain action that is unacceptable from the speaker's point of view, or to prevent such an action in the future. I. M. Osovskaya distinguishes the following types of prohibition: 1) command; 2) order; 3) instruction; 4) threat; 5) advice [10, p. 213]. It is necessary to admit that only some of the varieties specified by the researcher can be involved in confrontational communication. In particular, the prohibition-instruction provides for an action which is usually helpful for the addressee, moreover, it is carried out in writing. The prohibition-order functions exclusively in the official sphere of communication and this type of prohibition cannot be considered as conflictual in advance. The purpose of the prohibition-advice is to warn the listener against a dangerous or inappropriate act, and this type of prohibition implies the speaker's benevolence towards the addressee. Instead, such subtypes of prohibition as command and threat can be confrontational.

The author's concept. If we take into account the heterogeneous communicative nature of the speech units included into the group of speech acts of prohibition, it is not surprising that the concept of the author will vary, and accordingly, the concept of the addressee. So, it can be a person of higher social status, authority, who, taking into account objective circumstances, is personally interested (or forced to do so due to his official duties) in ensuring that the interlocutor does not perform some actions:

"You are not going to eat them, though," he cried roughly. "No! Not a single one" [11, p. 113].

The concept of the addressee. The addressee is a person with mostly limited communication rights or a person with equal communication status in relation to the interlocutor. He reluctantly does what is required of him, he is rarely personally interested in the performance of somebody's willpower.

The content of the event. There is a certain preliminary event that explains the reason for prohibition, otherwise the intention will be groundless. The speaker evaluates this event (or a series of events) as negative for himself, the addressee, or both at the same time, namely as such that can harm these persons. This event is either happening at the moment of speaking, or may happen in the future.

The factor of the communicative past. The prohibition acts both as an initial and as a reactive speech act. The prohibition is reactive when it is preceded by verbal actions that the speaker considers unacceptable for himself, and those verbal actions that contain some information that does not meet moral, ethical, aesthetic norms.

The factor of the communicative future. In case of unsuccessful implementation of prohibition, there may follow the acts that demonstrate a strict strategic line of behavior: disagreement, denial, reprimand, etc. The example below illustrates the act of disagreement:

"Sit down, Sheldon," said Clark, "and don't shout".

"I'm not shouting", said Sheldon [11, p. 78].

The linguistic implementation. In the English language, the main way of expressing prohibition is the negative form of the affirmative imperative which requires the addition of the auxiliary *do + not (don't)* to the infinitive of the verb without the particle *to*. I. Yu. Shkitskaya notes that this structure has a high frequency and is systematically used to express a prohibitive meaning, conveys this meaning most unambiguously, is the most specialized for expressing this meaning, and also is the most universal [12, pp. 111-115], for example:

'Oh, don't go on at that again' [13, p. 85];

'And don't speak to me like that and look like that' [13, p. 185].

Another way of expressing prohibition in English is the use of modal verbs in negative structures. The categorical form of prohibition often presupposes the use of the modal verb *can* in its structure. According to T. V. Parasiuk, it attributes to the speech act the meaning of "impossibility of performing this action due to the existence of specific circumstances or generally accepted laws that prevent the addressee from performing this action" [14, p. 142], for example:

'This is my room, you can't come in here just then you want, girl!' [11, p. 76].

The prohibition expressed by the construction with the modal verb *must* has a high degree of categoricalness. It is a reminder of some duties of the addressee, or the speaker is trying to prohibit something under duress:

'No, you mustn't talk like that to him' [15, p. 98];

The prohibition expressed by the modal verb *need* expresses the absence of the necessity to perform a certain action. In the case of non-conflictual communication, this form will prove that this is advice to the addressee from the speaker, but under the conditions of confrontational communication, taking into account paralinguistic factors, we can talk about the modification of the advice into the prohibition at the level of imperative recommendation and observe an increase in the categorical nature of the speech act:

'You needn't try and tell me what to do' [15, p. 123];

'No, you needn't. You needn't ask him at all' [15, p. 166].

Since the prohibition presupposes the completion of an action undesirable from the speaker's point of view, predicates that specialize in conveying the phase value of the end of the action often appear in the structure of imperative speech acts. It is enough for the speaker to use the imperative form of the phase verb to realize his imperative speech act:

"Oh stop, stop, stop," shouted Toby [11, p. 176].

It should be noted that such phase verbs are combined not with the infinitive of the verb to indicate the tabooed action, but with the gerund, which additionally conveys the forbidden action as a process that continues at the moment of speaking:

"Stop putting on an act, Bobby [13, p. 98].

To indicate the restriction of the interlocutor's actions in the English language, the word *only* can be used with the implication of prohibition on an action that is not included in the circle of those words related to the word *only*, thus establishing a clear line between what is allowed and what is forbidden:

John Thomas came on the car after Annie, at about a quarter to ten. He poked his head easily into the girls' waiting-room.

"Prayer-meeting?" he asked.

"Ay," said Laura Sharp. "*Ladies only*" [16, c. 127].

The speech act of prohibition is often characterized by the use of negative pronouns and adverbs. This list includes *no one*, *nobody*, *nothing*, *never*. A specific feature of the English language is the interaction of general and partial negation within an elementary sentence. The presence of a partial negation unit in connection with one of the non-verb components immediately blocks the possibility of using a general negation structure [44, p. 102]. It is the use of negative lexemes that creates the prohibitiveness of an action. Thus, when the subject or object in the sentence is expressed by a negative pronoun, the predicate is used in the affirmative form, for example: *nobody will come to this room*. In addition, it should be noted that the use of negative pronouns or adverbs in the English language, compared to the usual negative form of the verb, significantly strengthens the prohibition.

In the structure of speech acts of prohibition, emphatically polite etiquette formulas with the word *please* can appear, which reinforce the declaration of cold, neutral or hostile relations between speakers. In the following episode, a man is annoyed by the fact that his wife makes critical remarks about the field in which she knows nothing, and he wants to stop it, especially emphasizing his imperative volition:

He continued to enunciate. "Please do not talk of "significance", because you do not understand it. And that is because you are insignificant yourself" [18, p. 64].

Conclusion. The strategic predeterminedness of communication is the highest level of communication organization. The communication strategy covers both planning and implementation of the communication process. But depending on the actions of the interlocutor, on his immediate reaction, the speaker can change his initial communicative intention by changing the tactics of his speech behaviour. Gradually, the speaker performs a number of speech acts and, finally, implements that specific speech act which helps him to achieve communication success.

Imperative structures have an imperative nature of action expression and, therefore, have been studied from the point of view of those communicative intentions that form the basis of speech acts. In the course of this research, imperative speech acts of prohibition have been analyzed according to seven criteria: the communicative goal, the author's concept, the addressee's concept, the content of the event, the factor of the communicative past, the factor of the communicative future, the linguistic implementation. It has been found that the key linguistic means of imperative speech acts of prohibition are the grammatical structures of the negative imperative, which are often used to denote a prohibited action. Prohibition can also be implemented by using different modal verbs in their negative forms, phase verbs, negative pronouns and adverbs. There have been cases of using emphatic and polite etiquette imperative formulas of prohibition to emphasize the alienated and cool attitude of the speaker, who seeks to achieve his goal without resorting to unnecessary insults of the addressee.

All of the above-mentioned postulates will help, in the linguistic aspect, to focus research attention on identifying the potential opportunities of language units of different levels to express the imperative intentions of interlocutors in other speech acts of confrontational content.

Bibliography:

1. Белова А.Д. Поняття "стиль", "жанр", "дискурс", "текст" у сучасній лінгвістиці. Вісник КНУ ім. Т. Шевченка. Серія "Іноземна філологія". 2002. Вип. 32–33. С. 11–14.
2. Бессонова О.Л. Ієрархія цінностей та її відображення в англійській мові // Процедури концептуального аналізу в різноструктурних мовах / за заг. ред. О. Л. Бессонової. Донецьк: ДонНУ, 2012. Т. 7: Типологічні, зіставні, діахронічні дослідження. С. 18–91.
3. Бехта І.А. Дискурс наратора в англійській прозі. Київ: Грамота, 2014. 304 с.
4. Голубовська І.О. Етнічні особливості мовних картин світу: монографія. / 2-е вид., випр. і доп. Київ: Логос, 2004. 284 с.
5. Гувайнон Н.В. Слово Речення Текст. Вибрані праці. Чернівці: Чернівецький національний університет, 2009. 664 с.
6. Селіванова О.О. Основи теорії мовної комунікації. Черкаси: Видавництво Чабаненко Ю.А., 2011. 350 с.
7. Austin J.L. How to Do Things with Words. Kindle Edition: Barakaldo Books, 2020. 179 p.
8. Searle J. Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization. OUP, 2010. 224 p.
9. Бурбело В.Б. Сучасні концепції дискурсу та лінгво-прагматичні засади дискурсології. Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. 2002. Вип. 32–33. С. 79–84.
10. Осовська І.М. Концептосистема німецького парентального конфронтативного дискурсу. Науковий вісник Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія «Філологічні науки» (мовознавство). Дрогобич, 2015. № 3. С. 212–218.
11. Cronin A. J. Hatter's Castle. Foreign Languages Publishing House. K., 2003. 669 p.
12. Шкіцька І.Ю. Вербальна репрезентація негативних реакцій на маніпулятивну тактику підвищення значимості співрозмовника. *Мова і культура*. Київ, 2017. Вип. 19, Т. IV (184). С. 110–118.
13. Woolf V. Mrs. Dalloway. A Millenium Project, 2009. 220 p.
14. Парасюк Т.В. Дієслова на позначення емоційних станів: функціонально-онімасіологічний аспект. Львів: Видавничий центр Львів. нац. ун-ту ім. І. Франка, 2010. 280 с.
15. Galsworthy J. End of the Chapter. Foreign Publishing House. K., 2005. 602 p.
16. Wells H. G. The Invisible Man. Foreign Publishing House. K., 2009. 266 p.
17. Огоновська О.В. Дієслівне заміщення в англійській мові. Львів: Світ, 2011. 128 с.
18. Huxley A. Crome Yellow. Vintage Publishing, 2004. 192 p.

Олейнікова Г., Слободяк С. До питання про категорію імперативності в англійській комунікації (на прикладі мовленнєвого акту заборони в художній літературі)

Анотація. В даному дослідженні розглядається імперативність як функціонально-семантична категорія, яка відображає відношення висловлення мовця до реалій дійсності. Спонукальна сутність імперативності ґрунтується на її дієслівно-морфологічній формі з метою вираження комунікативної установки. З'ясування імперативності як категорії дозволило виокремити її комунікативно-прагматичні властивості, що виявляються у міжособистісних настановах, спрямованих на всіх учасників комунікації. У ході

дослідження було проаналізовано спонукальні мовленнєві акти заборони за сімома критеріями: комунікативна мета, концепція автора, концепція адресата, зміст події, чинник комунікативного минулого, чинник комунікативного майбутнього, мовне втілення. Було з'ясовано, що комунікативна мета мовленнєвого акту заборони заключається в тому, щоб примусити адресата припинити виконання певної дії, недопустимої з точки зору мовця, або ж не допустити таку дію в майбутньому. Автором заборони може бути особа, вища за соціальним статусом, авторитетна, яка особисто зацікавлена (або змушена це робити в силу службових обов'язків) у тому, щоб співрозмовник не виконував якоїсь дії. Адресатом виступає людина з обмеженими комунікативними правами або особа з рівним комунікативним статусом щодо співрозмовника. Заборона виступає і як ініціальний, і як реактивний мовленнєвий акт. Реактивною заборона є тоді, коли їй передують вербальні дії, які суб'єкт розцінює як неприйнятні щодо себе, ті, які містять інформацію, що не

відповідає нормам моральним, етичним, естетичним. У разі неуспішної реалізації заборони їй можуть відповідати акти, що демонструватимуть жорстку стратегічну лінію поведінки. Ключовими мовними засобами імперативних мовленнєвих актів заборони виступають граматичні структури наказового способу дієслова, яке позначає заборонену дію, із заперечною часткою *not*. Заборона може бути також реалізована за допомогою модальних дієслів в заперечній формі, фазових дієслів, заперечних займенників та прислівників. Встановлено випадки застосування підкреслено-ввічливих етикетних спонукальних формул заборони для підкреслення відчужених, прохолодних стосунків мовця, який прагне досягти свого, не вдаючись до зайвих образ.

Ключові слова: імперативність, імперативні структури, мовленнєві акти заборони, комунікативна мета, концепція автора, концепція адресата, зміст події, чинник комунікативного минулого, чинник комунікативного майбутнього, мовне втілення.