РОЗДІЛ 2
ГЕРМАНСЬКІ МОВИ

FUNCTIONING OF DIRECTIVE POLYILLOCUTIONARY VERBS
IN THE HISTORY OF MIDDLE ENGLISH

ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ДИРЕКТИВНИХ ПОЛІІЛОКУТИВНИХ ДІЄСЛІВ
В ІСТОРІЇ СЕРЕДНЬОАНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ

Matkovska M.V.,
orcid.org/0000-0002-1047-7027
Senior Lecturer at the Department of English
Kamianets-Podilskyi National University named after Ivan Ohienko

This paper is devoted to an outline analysis of functional peculiarities of certain directive polyillocutionary verbs in the poetic texts of the Middle English language. In particular, attention has been paid to the studying of Middle English directive verbs on the level of textual situations that can be identified as hierarchy of elements (conceptual cases). The main ones are *agent, patient, result, object, cause, condition, time, place, purpose* and their attitude to certain acts or actions.

The author examines the Middle English language social practical experience of participants of communication from the point of view of integral social approach on the basis of which rules of communication and appropriate mental constructions are formed. As a result the actual problem of polyillocutiveness has been identified as an ability of certain illocutionary verbs to have in their deep structure alongside with the locative seme some potential illocutive ones. It is postulated the idea that once being actualized in the process of communication this illocutive seme, merged with the seme of locution, will characterize the speech acts in the terms of assertive, directives, commissives and declaratives. One and the same polyillocutionary verb can realize its various potential illocutive senses (meanings), which depend on the communicative situation.

Intention may be identified as the main significative semantic criterion that indicates the type of the illocutionary act. The category of directiveness unites, correspondingly, those verbs that characterize the pragmatic meaning of directivity, combining within themselves the other illocutionary semes as, for example, assertive, commissive, etc. These are such verbs as *advise, propose, suggest, warn,* the general component of which is to make someone do something.

As a result it has been testified that conceptual models of Middle English social discourse are formed in consequence of processing information as ontological so axiological schemes that prearrange the nature of pragmatic direction of social discourse.

Key words: Middle English language, polyillocutiveness, semantics, directives, intention, illocutionary seme, proposition, social discourse.

Стаття присвячена функціональним особливостям директивних поліілокутивних дієслів в поетичних творах середньоанглійського періоду англійської мови. Зокрема, увагу зосереджено на вивченні середньоанглійських дієслів спонукання на рівні текстових ситуацій, що виступають у вигляді ієрархії елементів (концептуальних відмінків), основними з яких є *агенс, патієнс, результат, об'єкт, причина, умова, час, місце, ціль* та відношення відповідних елементів до певних дій чи актів. Автор досліджує мовні середньоанглійські соціальні практики учасників сфери спілкування з точки зору інтегрованого соціального підходу, у ході якого складаються правила самого мовлення, а значить, і відповідні розумові конструкції. В результаті висвітлено актуальну проблему поліілокутивності, яка є мовним явищем, тобто віртуально закріплена в глибинній структурі дієслова. Постулюється ідея, що в процесі мовленнєвої діяльності відповідно з комунікативною інтенцією адресанта відбувається відбір потрібної ілокутивної семи, яка, реалізуючись в мовленні одночасно з локутивною, визначає прагматичний тип мовленнєвого акту. Інтенціональність виступає основним смисловим (семантичним) критерієм, що визначає тип ілокутивного акту. Категорія директивності об'єднує, відповідно, ті дієслова, що характеризують прагматичне значення спонукання, поєднуючи в собі й інші ілокутивні семи, наприклад, асертивну, комісивну тощо. Це такі дієслова, як *advise, propose, suggest, warn,* загальним компонентом для яких виступає спонукання зі сторони адресанта того, щоб адресат виконав щось. В результаті засвідчено що, концептуальні моделі соціального дискурсу середньоанглійського періоду формуються внаслідок опрацювання інформації як онтологічного плану (ситуацій, дійсності), так і відповідних аксіологічних, емотивно-оцінних фокусів, що обумовлюють характер прагматичної спрямованості соціального дискурсу.

Ключові слова: середньоанглійська мова, поліілокутивність, директиви, інтенціональність, ілокутивна сема, пропозиція, соціальний дискурс.

Introduction. Verbalizations of many aspects of social life have been investigated by cultural, especially linguistic, anthropologists. It is true that verbs used in the performance and description of speech acts have been studied, but such studies were usually undertaken not only in view of the advancement of the theory (which is one of my ultimate aims as well) but also with strong theoretical prejudices; remember the attempts to classify speech-act types (e.g. Austin 1975; Brown P., Levinson S. 1987; Leech 1983; Searle 1969, 1979; Wiersbicka 2003) [1, p. 15–19]. As was recently pointed out by Susanti R., Wardani N. E. that speech-act theory, the framework for most of those studies, does itself embody an ideology (in particular an excessively "privatized" view of language) that is not necessarily applicable to other speech communities [2, p. 384–386]. This finding is entirely in keeping with the more general assumption, put forward by Miller, that theories of language are geared to (the needs of) the societies in which they are created [3, p. 71–77].

Studies of the social discourse are very popular among discourse analysis because they are seen in terms of the action and interaction of participating social members. One of the most important conditions for social interaction is that the communicating persons understand each other [4, p. 124].

G. Leech sheds light on the problems of linguistic actions in modern social discourse. He claims that reality itself is defined by the verb. Verbs affect the ways in which we perceive, think and act [5, p. 48–55].

The topicality of our investigation coincides with the role that social communication played within the lives of Middle English readers and speakers.

The **purpose of this paper** is to investigate the functioning of directive polyillocutionary verbs in Middle English social discourse and the ways of their using and perceiving by readers. We will try to prove the existence and relevance of usage of directive polyillocutionary verbs in Middle English social spheres of the human life. This paper is also an attempt to find convincing evidences to prove that our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally verbal in nature. That is why the poetic texts of Middle English literature were chosen as the base for our investigation of the directive verbs and their peculiarities in the social discourse. The concepts that govern our thoughts are not just matter of intellect. They govern our everyday functioning. Verb becomes a key to understanding thinking principles and processes. The reasons of verb expansion in linguistics, psychology, everyday life and its cognitive, semantic and pragmatic peculiarities can form the subject of our investigation.

Recent research and publications. The existing theoretical approaches could be balanced, for instance, by a systematic study of the words and expressions used to describe linguistic action, which is needed in order to lift part of the veil that is covering the language user's culture-specific and language-specific experience or conceptualization of his/her own speech activity. In other words we are advocating one type of empirical-conceptual approach to linguistic action, namely a lexical approach. By undertaking this type of research, a significant-though not totally new-contribution to the study of linguistic action can be made [6, p. 39–55]. An attempt will be made to keep the approach as theory-free as possible (though, for contrastive purposes, references will be made to the existing literature concerning the areas or aspects of linguistic action covered by those subfields) [7, p. 64–65]. Our hope is that thrusting the methodological balance to the opposite extreme may reveal more clearly than a "mature" application would have done how a lexical approach can provide us with revealing data concerning linguistic action, on the basis of which the many unresolved theoretical issues can be tackled [8, p. 224]. Further research, however, will have to recognize the impossibility of abstracting completely from theories. Only such recognition can guard us against pitfalls similar, though opposite, to those that victimized speech-act theory [9, p. 224–232].

According to Searle's classical definition of directive speech acts, the point of a directive is to get the hearer to do something. The speaker expresses a wish; and the proposition specifies a future act to be done by the hearer. This definition is geared to the central instances of directing, namely commands and requests [10, p. 113].This means that it would be wrong to adopt it is a rigid criterion for including or excluding a verb our expression in or from the set of verbal of directing.

The result would be the exclusion of many verbal about which we intuit that they refer to linguistic actions that possess a directive force of some kind; we would be left with *to command, to request, to beg*, and their synonyms. It would be equally wrong, after using our intuition to round up the verbs of directing, to force their meaning into the mold of Searle's definition. For instance, it is impossible to describe every directive speech act as an attempt to get the hearer to do something. But how can a linguistic action that is not an attempt to get the hearer to do something, be regarded as an act of directing? The answer will reveal itself in the course of the following introductory and sketchy overview of directives that deviate somehow from the central instances of commanding and requesting.

The first type of directive that departs from the central eases outlined by Searle's definition is commonly described by means of *to prohibit* and its synonyms. Prohibitions direct the hearer to not doing something instead of doing something. In this case the deviation is minimal. The act is clearly a directive one. The second deviant type: *to ask,* when used to describe the asking of a question (instead of as an equivalent of *to request*), refers to acts the propositional content of which does not specify the future act to be done by the hearer is a response to the question. This is clear from the verb itself [10, p. 127–132].

To dare in the sense of to challenge to do something requiring boldness and skill stands apart from the central directives in that it does not usually imply the speaker's belief that the hearer is able (or bold enough) to do what he/she is trying to get him/her to do. Such an implication is traditionally assigned (as a 'preparatory condition) to acts of commanding and requesting [10, p. 15].

Anna Wierzbicka also points out that acts of threatening can be directive. It is meant only conditional threats such as *"if I ever see you with my sister again, I'll kill you"*. The latter is clearly an attempt to keep the hearer away from the speaker's sister, and the act as a whole can be described by means of *to threaten* as in 'S threatened H with S's sister again. Also in this case the future act to be performed by the hearer is not specified in the propositional content. Moreover, threatening is never purely directive. In its unconditional form it is simply commissive and lacks directive aspects. In its conditional form it is at the same time commissive (though not as strongly as a promise, since the obligation' it creates to inflict harm is unlikely to lead towards the speaker's being reproached in case he/she does not act in accordance with his/her commitment) [9, p. 157].

According to Nisa K *et al,* there are two more types of directives that are in fact mixtures between directives and some other type of linguistic action [11, p. 64].

The first of these mixed classes is represented by *to advise* and *to warn*. Usually acts of advising and warning are partly – if not primarily – assertive. In what sense can they be said to be directive? A piece of advice is an indication of a preferable course of action. Its directive force does not necessarily derive from a wish on the part of the speaker but rather from the fact that a particular course of action is presented as preferable because it is to the hearer's benefit. On the other hand, warning is an indication of an event or course of action to be detrimental to the hearer [11, p. 65].

The second mixed class is more troublesome, not because it is less clearly directive than advising and warning, but simply because of recent attempts to declare it a monolithic commissive. The acts in question can be described by means of *to permit* and its equivalents. The argument goes like this: when giving his/her permission to do something, the speaker commits him/herself to not obstructing a particular action on the part of the hearer; hence, a permission is a kind of promise; therefore, it is commissive rather than a directive. This is a decent argument in favor of the claim that permission is commissive. But it presents no evidence against classifying permissions as directives. Unless one accepts that every type of speech act can belong to only one class. But that is one of the main errors it is hoped this assay will help to abolish. Yet permitting is not a central type of directing. It cannot be described as an attempt to get the hearer to do something [9, p. 77].

Like advising, permission is an indication of a certain course of action. Unlike advising, permitting does not imply that the speaker presents that course of action as preferable to the hearer. But permitting implies that the hearer him/herself prefers his/her doing the action over his/her not doing it. Moreover, the speaker not only indicates a course of action that the hearer regards as desirable, but he/she also uses his/her authority over the hearer to open the way to that course of action.

Just as with commanding and requesting, the propositional content of a linguistic act of permitting specifies a future act to be done by the hearer. This fact pulls permissions away from other commissives, which usually contain a proposition specifying an act to be done by the speaker.

Thus one could say that the directive aspect of permissions is quite explicit, whereas the commissive aspect remains largely implicit [12, p. 77]. One could object that an utterance such as *"You may go to the movies tonight"* is quite explicitly and overtly commissive because it means – due to the presence of "may" – *"I commit myself to not obstructing your going to the movies tonight"*. But such a claim would already be based on a semantic analysis that uses as a premise the belief permissions are primarily commissive ones.

Presentation of the main material. Advisel. Directive Meaning

I advise any representative of the present authorities ... to look around and see for himself what the masses of the world think of their authorities [13].

Syntactic structures of containing *advise1* in the state of the performative verb, as explicit stimulating illocutionary force can be introduced in the following way:

S + PV + Indirect Object +to-Infinitive

Syntactic form of *advise1* in the social medieval discourse correlates only with the infinitive constructions which represent a surface realization for the structure, for example, *I should advise you to change your moral views.* It means that the infinitive constructions, corresponding to volitive subordinate clause, in other words, which are used with the semantic preferable mood and introduce the situation as an unreal one which is not correlated with the reality.

The introductory part of *advise1* as explicit volitional illocutionary force, which is introduced by addition of the addressee, as a communicative addressee which divides and connects simultaneously introductory performative part without/with concretizing sentential, he (addressee) is a doer of stimulating action, that is the subject of predicative kernel of the sentential part. Sentential part of utterances, containing *advise1* in the state of indicator of the action "to advise" from the point of view of the speaker to get it that the hearer makes something which would be presented in the convolute form because it would be expressed with the help of the infinitive constructions.

If we compare syntactic and illocutionary properties of the verb *advise1,* realizing the meaning of directing, on the one hand, and *assure1,* realizing the meaning of commissiveness, on the other hand, we will have the following semantic structure: S + PV + Indirect Object + to-Infinitive, we have come to the conclusion that communicative addressee with the verb *advise1* plays the main role of the doer of an action. Communicative addressee with the verb *assure1* is an optional one, because the doer of the action is the hearer.

So, *advise1* and *assure1* have similar syntactic parameters but fundamentally have different illocutionary roles of the first and the second octants. *Advise1* functions as an intransitive verb in the social Middle English discourse

Advise1, explicating directive illocutionary force, foresees the realization of the action in the future. The sentential contest is that the hearer will commit a future action. It would be better to make an analysis of the social context which will reflect the real situations. Utterance can be pronounced as an advice-motive. It means, according to T. A. van Dijk, that the hearer must not only make a conclusion of the form of utterance that it is a motive-advice but also the conditions would be carried out with the help of which in the given social structure the speech act is represented [4, p. 152]. Only those hearers, who have necessary information about the pragmatic context, can decide if the bases are enough to interpret the

receiving information as a motive-advice and only than to carry out it or not.

Semantic structure of utterance includes the speaker who impels the addressee to realize the act which is represented by the propositional context [12, p. 127].

In accordance with that, *advise1,* indicating motive illocutionary force, has addressee-oriented direction because the hearer is connected with an action as a doer. The pragmatic category of conditional unconditional realization of an action is also relevant to the polyillocutionary verbs of speech acts, actualizing the main meaning of motive. *Advise1* foresees conditional realization of an action; it means that the action wouldn't be realized till the hearer expresses permission on realization of it. Utterance, reflecting public reality, indicates the conditional use of *advise1*.

In other words, in spite of call of the international community, the actions of settling of the conflict wouldn't be considered till collective addressee "You" (the authorities of Iran) agrees to solve it. Pragmatic category of cost/benefit reflects the scale of valuables of the speaker/hearer, in other words, it is reflected something as desirable or undesirable for the speaker/hearer in the interpersonal informal relations.

For instance, there is some difference between "advising" in which the occurrence/act of proposal part is useful for the hearer and "requesting" in which the occurrence/act of proposal part is unsafe for the speaker.

But in the public discourse of Middle English the given examples are the system of norms and rules, principles and laws, being pragmatic, changeable facts, can be interchanged. It means that the scale of valuables for the speaker/hearer is given, i.e. something which is desirable for the speaker/hearer, for instance, to settle the conflict which is also desirable for the speaker.

So, the pragmatically-changeable unit of cost/benefit for the speaker/hearer in public discourse is realized not from the point of view of its own interest, which is the characteristic of interpersonal relations, but from the point of view of the law which prescribes the fulfillment of the engagements by all subjects of international law conscientiously.

The analysis of utterances, including advise1 in the state of an indicator of motive illocutionary force, helps us make the conclusion that *advise1* is a conditional illocutionary verb. *I **advise** that the … will not submit a written statement to the Court under Article 66, paragraph 2, of the Court's Statute other than formally transmitting the observation of Mr. Mortished* [13].

The pragmatic situation of utterance with the verb *advise2,* performing the function of the indicator of assertive illocutionary act, is introduced as a report. The illocutionary direction of *advise2,* as we see from the given example, is only to fix the responsibility of the lawyer-consultant about the decision of the Secretary.

In the given example, the speaker and the addressee, forming semantic structure of utterance, correlate only with the propositional part but don't take part in it. The syntactic structure of utterances, including *advise2* in of illocutionary force, can be represented in the following way: S + PV + that-clause; S + Hedged PV + Indirect Object + that-clause. The most typical syntactic structure of utterances with the verb *advise2* in the public discourse is that one where the performative verb is correlated with the propositional part, presenting as additional subordinate clauses.

An introductory part of *advise2,* realizing the meaning of assertiveness, in the same way as *advise 1,* realizing the meaning of motive, can govern by addition of addressee, but with the only difference, that *advise2* persuades the addressee in the reality of the report, and *advise1* impels the addressee to the realization of some acts.

The verb *advise2* is combined with the propositional part, i.e. proposition, which is introduced by the subject and the predicate. The mood of the performative verb is indicative, because the given verb forms an utterance, including additional subordinate clauses, events which are considered by the speaker as the real facts, correlating with the reality and the time of realization of action, represented by the propositional part, can be represent or future.

Advise2, explicating an assertive illocutionary force, also plays the role of hedged performative, i.e. performative which is able to include in its introductory part the modal verbs. *Advise2* functions as an intransitive verb. The utterances, correlating with the additional subordinate clauses, as was mentioned before, prove their intransitive character. There is some difference between "advising" in which the occurrence/act of proposal part is useful for the hearer and "requesting" in which the occurrence/act of proposal part is unsafe for the speaker. So, directing is not only one of the fundamental functions of language, it is also one of the vital essential items in the social life; for the performance of this role the directive function of language is usually put into an action.

Thus, institutional correspondence, representing its exchanges of the notes, letters and functions on two levels: on the one hand as a level of the written interactive discourse at the length, that is the discourse, supposing interaction between communicants: the speaker and the addressee. It begins with the form of address to me addressee and ends with the words of politeness. The texts, representing the telegraphic style, don't include the formula of etiquette. On the other hand, institutional correspondence functions on the level of illocutionary structures, i.e. the structures which have illocutionary acts [8, p. 125].

Conclusions. We use language to communicate with each other, to exchange our knowledge, to explain our behavior, to express our feeling, to enrich our worldview and to reflect everyday events and environment around us. The relationship between linguistic theory and the way the language being actualized as behavior in contexts of use is the process of continual creative interpretation and reappraisal. We have been claiming that the directive polyillocutionary verbs structured different communicative concepts in the history of Middle English. The whole phenomenon of verb, no doubt, needs some further investigations, as it plays an important role in public social communication during the historical development of the English language.

REFERENCES:

1. Austin J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Cambridge University, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975. 168 p.

2. Susanti R., Wardani N. E. An Analysis of The Speech Acts in Anthology of Short Stories "9 dari Nadira" by Leila S. Chudori. *Fifth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics*. 2019. P. 383–388. DOI: 10.2991/prasasti-19.2019.66.

3. Miller G. A. Linguistics, psycholinguistics and the cognitive science. *Baltimore*. 1990. Vol. 66. P. 66–145.

4. Dijk T. A. van., Kintch W. Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. N. Y. : Academic Press, 1983. 289 p.

5. Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. London : Longman, 1983. 249 p.

6. Fauconnier G. and Turner M. The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities. New York : Basic Books, 2002. 382 p.

7. Copeland J. E. New Directions in Linguistics and Semantics. Houston : Rice University Studies, 1984. 267 p.

8. Brown P., Levinson S. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1987. 345 p.

9. Wierzbicka A. Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human interaction. Berlin / NY: Walter de Gruyter, 2003. 502 p.

10. Searle John R. Speech acts. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1979. 198 p.

11. Nisa K., Manaf N. A. (2021). Analysis of Illocutionary Speech Acts on Student's Social Media Post and Comments. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. Vol. 10. №1. P. 62–67. DOI: 10.15294/SELOKA.V10I1.44409

12. Searle John R. Expression and meaning: studies in the theory of speech acts. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1979. 187 p.

13. The Dream of Rhonabwy. *Ballads and Legends of Cheshire* (102–111). https://d.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/theme/arthur

НАЦІОНАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНА СПЕЦИФІКА ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЗМІВ ІЗ ТЕМАТИЧНОЇ ГРУПИ «МОРАЛЬНІ ВІДНОСИНИ» (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ НІМЕЦЬКОЇ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВ)

NATIONAL-CULTURAL FEATURES OF GERMAN AND UKRAINIAN PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS FROM THE THEMATIC GROUP "MORAL RELATIONS"

Махоніна Н.Г.,
orcid.org/0000-0003-0630-7292
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри перекладу
Національного технічного університету «Дніпровська Політехніка»

Стаття відноситься до області лінгвокраїнознавчих та лінгвокультурологічних досліджень. У ній на матеріалі німецької та української мов розглядається вербалізація уявлень про моральні відносини, виявляються національно-культурні особливості українських та німецьких фразеологізмів тематичної групи «Моральні відносини». Прояви національно-культурних особливостей досліджується на двох рівнях – лінгвокраїнознавства та лінгвокультурології. Для аналізу беруться українські та німецькі фразеологічні одиниці предикативного характеру (прислів'я, приказки). Виявлення національно-культурної специфіки у фразеологізмах за допомогою лінгвокраїнознавчої методології здійснюється через пошук прототипів, розгляд особливостей компонентного складу фразеологізмів та їхньої внутрішньої форми. На основі проаналізованого матеріалу робиться висновок про те, що культурно-національний компонент семантики фразеологізмів української та німецької мов досліджуваної тематичної групи проявляється абсолютно ідентично. Розкриття національно-культурної специфіки у фразеологізмах методами лінгвокультурології відбувається шляхом показу національно обумовленої концептосфери, вербалізованої через прислів'я та приказки. Вербалізація моральних відносин вивчається методом порівняння репрезантації аксіом поведінки (аксіоми взаємодії, життєзабезпечення, спілкування, відповідальності, управління, реалізму, безпеки та розсудливості) у двох мовах. В результаті автор доходить висновку, що в обох культурах паремійна картина світу має ідентичну структуру, що пояснюється тим, що аксіоми поведінки, які регулюють моральні відносини між людьми, мають універсальний, загальний для всього людства характер, не зважаючи на існування відносних і локальних систем моралі, які розвиваються в рамках конкретних суспільств та історичних періодів. Дослідження містить багатий ілюстративний матеріал.

Ключові слова: лінгвокраїнознавство; паремійна картина світу; мовна картина світу; засоби вербалізації концептів; лінгвокультурологічні дослідження.

This article belongs to the area of country studies through language and cultural linguistics. It deals with the verbalization of idea of moral and moral relations in German and Ukrainian languages, reveals national and cultural characteristics of the Ukrainian and German phraseological units of the thematic group "Moral Relations". The manifestations of national and cultural characteristics are investigated at two levels: country studies through language and cultural linguistics. The analysis is based on Ukrainian and German phraseological units of a predicative nature (proverbs, sayings). The identification of national and cultural specific characteristics in phraseology using the methods of country studies through language is carried out through the search for prototypes, the component analysis of idioms and review of their internal form. On the basis of the analyzed material, the author arrives at a conclusion that the cultural and national component of Ukrainian and German idioms belonging to the analyzed thematic group is manifested absolutely identically. The disclosure of national-cultural features in phraseological units by the methods of linguocultural studies is carried out by showing the nationally determined concept sphere verbalised through proverbs and sayings. The verbalisation of moral relations is studied by comparing the representation of eight axioms of behaviour (axiom of interaction, life support, communication, responsibility, management, realism, safety and common sense) in two languages. As a result, the author comes to the