

УДК 802.0-56 (075.8)

Candidate of Science (Philology), associate professor Suima I. P.

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Ukraine;

e-mail: Suima-irina@mail.ru, mob.: +3 8097-150-46-87; ORSID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2209-8614>; Journal ID:3498

EVASIVE ANSWERS WITH OTHER FORMS OF RESPONSE

к. філол. н., доцент Суїма І.П.

Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара, Україна,

e-mail: Suima-irina@mail.ru, mob.: +3 8097-150-46-87; ORSID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2209-8614>; Journal ID:3498

УХИЛЬНІ ВІДПОВІДІ З ІНШИМИ ВИДАМИ РЕАГУВАННЯ

к. филол. н., доцент Суима И.П.

Днепропетровский национальный университет имени Олеся Гончара, Украина;

e-mail: Suima-irina@mail.ru, mob.: +3 8097-150-46-87; ORSID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2209-8614>; Journal ID:3498

УКЛОНЧИВЫЕ ОТВЕТЫ С ДРУГИМИ ВИДАМИ РЕАГИРОВАНИЯ

The relevance of the article is in line with the central problems of modern communicative linguistics, is caused, on the one hand, by the lack of sophistication and ambiguity in understanding the communicative unit, its volume and its constituent parts, and, on the other hand, by the lack of a comprehensive study and description of all initiating and reacting communicative moves in dialogue as a form of speech.

The purpose of the article is in line with the central problems of modern communicative linguistics, is caused, on the one hand, by the lack of sophistication and ambiguity in understanding the communicative unit, its volume and its constituent parts, and, on the other hand, by the lack of a comprehensive study and description of all initiating and reacting communicative moves in dialogue as a form of speech.

The object of study is the question-answer dialogic unity, the components of which are communicative moves. The subject of the research is the semantic and pragmatic features of an evasive speech act in the oral and written dialogic speech of modern English (in the so-called official and unofficial dialogue) as a manifestation of the intention to reject speech action by the addressee of the survey.

Since the stimuli in the dialogue in the form of initiating communicative moves have been studied quite fully, including in terms of their modality, we restrict ourselves to considering reactions in the dialogue in the form of response remarks, namely, evasive answers for the question. Evasive answers as an object of study attracted the attention of scientists. But, not being the main goal of research, the study of evasion as a phenomenon was carried out by the authors fragmentarily, along with the solution of other problems, and therefore today there is no holistic understanding of the features of evasive statements.

The factual material that was analyzed also revealed various combinations of evasive statements with other types of reactions. There is such a mixed communicative move as evasion in the form of a "retrieval" of a direct answer due to the difficulty of answering it, after which the responder still tries to answer the question.

Evasive statements in the English language as a non-self-contained, unified speech act have their own illocutionary powers and perlocutionary effect and may include informative, reactive, socially regulatory, emotive and deictic illocutionary acts in accordance with their communicative functions. Evasive statements are intentionally semantically irrelevant responses to a stimulus question, of which two types are open and hidden evasive speech acts. In the first case, the addressee signals the interlocutor about his unwillingness to cooperate. In the second case, he leaves the answer in a hidden way. The study confirmed the fact that, guided by a pragmatic approach, evasive speech act should be defined as a complex speech act represented by a minimal segment of discourse (communicative step / move), uttered in a specific dialogical context, characterized by a basic illocution (the purpose of evading a direct answer to asked question), having a specific structure, grammatically designed, characterized by certain lexical, grammatical, syntactic and prosodic by such means, taking into account the paralinguistic aspect, reflecting the speaker's intentions and personal characteristics of the communicants reacting and listening, their social-role relationship and communication distance, directed by their influence on the addressee of the question. An analysis of the factual material allowed us to conclude that evasive speech act as an activity includes a formal and substantive aspect.

Key words: communication, dialogue, verbal and non-verbal means of communication, replica-reaction, function, communicative act, replica-evasion.

Актуальність теми дослідження, яка є однією з центральних проблем комунікативної лінгвістики, пов'язана, з одного боку, з недостатньою опрацьованістю і неоднозначністю в розумінні і трактуванні комунікативної одиниці, її складових, а з іншого боку – з відсутністю всебічного дослідження і опису всіх ініціюючих і реплік та реплік-реакцій в діалозі як формі мови.

Мета дослідження полягає у виявленні та описі засобів, що використовуються носіями англійської мови для вираження ухилення від відповіді, і в побудові на основі цього класифікації висловлювань-ухилень.

Об'єктом вивчення є діалогічна єдність питання-відповідь, компонентами якого є комунікативні ходи. Предметом дослідження є семантичні і прагматичні особливості ухильного мовного акту в усному та письмовому діалогічному мовленні англійської мови як прояви інтенції неприйняття мовної дії того, хто запитує.

Оскільки стимули в діалозі у формі ініціюючих комунікативних рухів вивчені досить повно, в тому числі з точки зору їх модальності, ми обмежуємося розглядом реакцій в діалозі у формі відповіді, а саме ухильних відповідей на питання. Ухильні відповіді як об'єкт дослідження привернули увагу вчених. Але, не будучи основною метою дослідження, вивчення ухилення як явища проводилося авторами фрагментарно, поряд з вирішенням інших проблем, і тому сьогодні немає цілісного розуміння особливостей висловлювань-ухилень.

Фактичний матеріал, який був проаналізований, також виявив різні комбінації ухильних реакцій з іншими її типами. Існує такий змішаний комунікативний хід, як ухилення в формі «пошуку» прямої відповіді через складність знаходження відповіді на нього, після чого респондент все ще намагається відповісти на питання.

Ухильні висловлювання в англійській мові як самостійні, уніфіковані мовні акти мають свої іллокутивні здатності і перлокутивний ефект і можуть включати інформативні, реактивні, соціальні, емоційні та дієві іллокутивні акти відповідно до їх комунікативних функцій. Ухильні висловлювання навмисно семантично не мають сенсу як відповідь на питання, вони поділяються на два типи: відкриті та приховані ухильні мовленнєві акти. У першому випадку адресат сигналізує співрозмовнику про своє небажання співпрацювати. У другому випадку він намагається уникнути відповіді приховано. Дослідження підтвердило той факт, що, керуючись прагматичним підходом, ухильний мовленнєвий акт повинен бути визначений як складний мовний акт, поданий мінімальним сегментом дискурсу, виголошений у певному діалогічному контексті, що характеризується базовою іллокуцією. Аналіз

фактичного матеріалу дозволив зробити висновок, що ухильний мовленнєвий акт як діяльність включає в себе формальний і змістовний аспекти.

Ключові слова: комунікація, діалог, вербальні та невербальні засоби спілкування, репліка-реакція, функція, комунікативний акт, репліка-ухиляння.

Актуальность темы исследования, которая является одной из центральных проблем коммуникативной лингвистики, связана, с одной стороны, с недостаточной разработанностью и неоднозначностью в понимании и трактовке коммуникативной единицы, ее составляющих, а с другой стороны – с отсутствием всестороннего исследования и описания всех иницилирующих и реагирующих реплик в диалоге как форме речи.

Цель исследования состоит в выявлении и описании средств, используемых носителями английского языка для выражения уклонения, и в построении на основе этого классификации уклончивых высказываний.

Объектом изучения является вопросно-ответное диалогическое единство, компоненты которого представляют собой коммуникативные ходы. Предметом исследования являются семантические и прагматические особенности уклончивого речевого акта в устной и письменной диалогической речи английского языка как проявления интенции неприятия речевого действия адресатом вопроса.

Поскольку стимулы в диалоге в форме иницилирующих коммуникативных движений изучены достаточно полно, в том числе с точки зрения их модальности, мы ограничиваемся рассмотрением реакций в диалоге в форме ответных замечаний, а именно уклончивых ответов на вопрос. Уклончивые ответы как объект исследования привлекли внимание ученых. Но, не являясь основной целью исследования, изучение уклонения как явления проводилось авторами фрагментарно, наряду с решением других проблем, и поэтому сегодня нет целостного понимания особенностей уклончивых высказываний.

Фактический материал, который был проанализирован, также выявил различные комбинации уклончивых утверждений с другими типами реакций. Существует такой смешанный коммуникативный ход, как уклонение в форме «поиска» прямого ответа из-за сложности ответа на него, после чего респондент все еще пытается ответить на вопрос.

Уклончивые высказывания на английском языке в качестве самостоятельного, унифицированного речевого акта имеют свои иллокутивные способности и перлокутивный эффект и могут включать информативные, реактивные, социально регулирующие, эмоциональные и действенные иллокутивные акты в соответствии с их коммуникативными функциями. Уклончивые высказывания – это намеренно семантически не имеющие смысла ответы на вопрос, из которых два типа являются открытыми и скрытыми уклончивыми речевыми актами. В первом случае адресат сигнализирует собеседнику о своем нежелании сотрудничать. Во втором случае он пытается уйти от ответа скрытно. Исследование подтвердило тот факт, что, руководствуясь прагматическим подходом, уклончивый речевой акт должен быть определен как сложный речевой акт, представленный минимальным сегментом дискурса, произнесенный в определенном диалогическом контексте, характеризующемся базовой иллокуцией. Анализ фактического материала позволил сделать вывод, что уклончивый речевой акт как деятельность включает в себя формальный и содержательный аспекты.

Ключевые слова: коммуникация, диалог, вербальные и невербальные средства общения, репліка-реакція, функція, комунікативний акт, репліка-уклонение.

Problem statement and relevance. In the works of English-speaking authors, one can come across a term “evasion” [4;5;6;7;8;9]. It is possible to classify this or that

statement as evasive only when considering it in connection with the initiating remark based on its function in a speech consisting in not giving the interlocutor a direct answer to the question [1;2;3]. The indicated feature of evasive statements determined the functional and pragmatic orientation of the present study, that is, the study of informal properties of language units acting as evasive statements, and the features of their functioning of this role and the acquisition of various shades of meaning due to context.

The research deals with the study of the phenomenon of evasion and the interactive properties of evasive statements in English from the standpoint of pragmalinguistics and the theory of verbal communication. The approach taken in the work is based on the understanding that verbal communication is a specific type of human activity that is included in other areas of a person's practical activity. The interactive side of communication is the organization of interaction between communicating individuals, that is, in the exchange of actions.

The purpose of the article is in line with the central problems of modern communicative linguistics, is caused, on the one hand, by the lack of sophistication and ambiguity in understanding the communicative unit, its volume and its constituent parts, and, on the other hand, by the lack of a comprehensive study and description of all initiating and reacting communicative moves in dialogue as a form of speech.

The object of study is the question-answer dialogic unity, the components of which are communicative moves. **The subject** of the research is the semantic and pragmatic features of an evasive speech act in the oral and written dialogic speech of modern English (in the so-called official and unofficial dialogue) as a manifestation of the intention to reject speech action by the addressee of the survey.

The presentation of the main material. Since the stimuli in the dialogue in the form of initiating communicative moves have been studied quite fully,

including in terms of their modality, we restrict ourselves to considering reactions in the dialogue in the form of response remarks, namely, evasive answers for the question. Evasive answers as an object of study attracted the attention of scientists. But, not being the main goal of research, the study of evasion as a phenomenon was carried out by the authors fragmentarily, along with the solution of other problems, and therefore today there is no holistic understanding of the features of evasive statements.

The factual material that was analyzed also revealed various combinations of evasive statements with other types of reactions. There is such a mixed communicative move as evasion in the form of a "retrieval" of a direct answer due to the difficulty of answering it, after which the responder still tries to answer the question. For example:

A: What is the current public opinion on the state of the conflict among the Chechen minority?

B: It's a difficult one to answer because nobody really knows. What one can say about people living in Chechnya is that they have a very hard time indeed. Most of: hem live in Grozny, which has been completed to the heaviest bombardment, both in this war and in the last one (BBC News, 01.20.2000).

In the first communicative step, evasion is expressed by an impersonal constructive construction explaining the reason for the impossibility of an answer. The following communicative steps, represented by constipations with various types of complex relationships, complex and simple sentences, give a detailed point of view on the problem of public opinion about the conflict among the minority in Chechnya.

The use of open evasion in the form of a "retrieval" of the answer is revealed, for which an attempt is made to predict the further possible course of events. For example:

A: Is there any possibility that the Chechen fighters may be able to withstand the attack and prevail as they did in 1996?

B: *It's a difficult one to answer. If you're talking about Grozny, I think the Chechens can only withstand an attack for so long. It might well be that the Chechens are able to sustain this war for as long as the last one. I think that the problems that the Chechens will find is that it doesn't seem this time round that they have the popular support that they did in the last war, and that may prove decisive this time* (BBC News, 20.01.2000).

Evasion of a direct answer is represented in the first communicative step by an impersonal constative, “diverting” the answer. In further communicative steps expressed by assertives and constatives with predicates in the indicative and subjunctive moods and with modal verbs “could”, “might”, “may”, conveying assumptions and doubts, the author's vision of the future development of the military situation in Chechnya is given.

Together with the “retrieval” of the response, the reacting communicant can still give the intended answer. For example:

A: *She fell in love with you at the same time?*

B: *That's hard to say. My guess is after. She returned my feelings* (Time, I.08.1992).

The “retrieval” of the answer due to its difficulty is represented by an impersonal constative; the proposed answer is represented by a simple assertive and constructive construction.

The reacting communicator uses the “retrieval” of the answer, but subsequently makes an assumption regarding the propositional content of the question. For example:

A: *Who is arming the Chechen rebels? They seem to be well armed and well trained.*

B: *Well this is the question that the government repeatedly ask themselves and one of the questions that the media repeatedly ask. The answer to your question is that there is no easy answer. However, having said that, there could well be other sources. But certainly, the suspicion at the moment is*

that he money is coming from the Middle East (BBC News, 01.20.2000).

The second communicative step, constative, states that there is no easy answer to the question. Further communicative steps put forward assumptions on the sources of weapons of the Chechen fighters.

The addressee may shy away from answering the first question and ignore the second question. For example:

A: Would you have installed a secular democratic government, gradually withdrawing to a role of strictly spiritual leader?

B: When we were in Tibet as early as 1921 set up one reform committee and started work for reformation. Obviously the last Dalai Lama also seems as convinced that Tibet needed some change. Even without this new development I think some change suddenly will take place but I feel this tragic situation, on one side there are some very interesting experiences but on the other side there are also some positive results (BBC Mews, 23.02.2000).

In the first two communicative steps, this kind of hidden evasion is used, such as changing the focus and context of the question by entering propositions that are not related to the first question. Further, the focus of the question changes, nevertheless placed in the context of the question, and finally, in the second part of the final communicative step, new propositions are introduced that are not coherently related to the question. The second question is not taken into account by the addressee, and there is no reaction to it.

Conclusions and prospectives. Summing up the consideration of various types of open and hidden evasion, it seems appropriate to trace the interlocutor's reaction to the evasive statement. Most often, such a reaction is a question re-asking.

Evasive statements in the English language as a non-self-contained, unified speech act have their own illocutionary powers and perlocutionary effect and may include informative, reactive, socially regulatory, emotive and deictic

illocutionary acts in accordance with their communicative functions. Evasive statements are intentionally semantically irrelevant responses to a stimulus question, of which two types are open and hidden evasive speech acts. In the first case, the addressee signals the interlocutor about his unwillingness to cooperate. In the second case, he leaves the answer in a hidden way. The study confirmed the fact that, guided by a pragmatic approach, evasive speech act should be defined as a complex speech act represented by a minimal segment of discourse (communicative step / move), uttered in a specific dialogical context, characterized by a basic illocution (the purpose of evading a direct answer to asked question), having a specific structure, grammatically designed, characterized by certain lexical, grammatical, syntactic and prosodic by such means, taking into account the paralinguistic aspect, reflecting the speaker's intentions and personal characteristics of the communicants reacting and listening, their social-role relationship and communication distance, directed by their influence on the addressee of the question. An analysis of the factual material allowed us to conclude that evasive speech act as an activity includes a formal and substantive aspect. The formal side includes linguistic units, intonation. The content side of the evasive speech act covers the propositional meaning (informational content) and pragmatic components, such as the illocutionary function, motive, goal, tactics of influencing the addressee, social and personal characteristics of the participants in communication, their emotional state and perlocative effect of communication.

The main features of evasive speech act include:

- 1) orientation to the addressee;
- 2) situationality;
- 3) selectivity;
- 4) variability;
- 5) a tendency toward stereotyping.

As for prospectives, it seems possible to develop research in several ways.

First, to deepen the description, on the basis of the proposed model, it is necessary to study the details that affect the discourse management process, clarify the factors that are essential for choosing tactics of evasion and the communicative move – evasive response to a question, and approach the analysis of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between moves and tactics.

Secondly, the scope and descriptions should be expanded to include strategies and tactics that have not yet been explored. Speech strategies are part of our common knowledge – knowledge about the processes of speech communication, in particular about ways to achieve communicative goals. As we have seen, evasion strategies and tactics form an open list, since they reflect the whole variety of processes of social interaction with all its unpredictability and even logic. New types of communicative situations, new forms of communication (for example, via the Internet) and the corresponding types of discourse can become the basis for the formation of new strategic and tactical decisions.

The principle of describing a speech strategy and tactics of avoiding answering a question, confirming / refuting or issuing complete relevant information seems to make it possible to do without particular schemes tailored to a specific case. These schemes can be, at first glance, very simple, but not reflecting the real complexity of the processes of speech communication.

References

1. Меньшиков И. И. (2012). Типология респонсивных предложений в современном русском языке / Избранные труды по лингвистике. Днепропетровск : Новая идеология. 326 с.
2. Михайлов Л. М. (1984) Диалогическое единство как коммуникативная единица. Всесоюзная научная конференция «Коммуникативные единицы языка». Тезисы докладов (12-13 декабря). М.: МГПИИШ им. М. Тореца». С. 79-80.
3. Падучева Е. В. (1982) Прагматические аспекты связности диалога / Изв. АН СССР. Москва. Т. 41. С. 305-313.
4. Sadock J. M. (1975) Toward a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press. 168 p.

5. Sanders R. E. (1987) Cognitive Foundations of Calculated Speech. New York: SUNY Press. 273 p.
6. Schiffrin D. (1994) Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Blackwell. 470p.
7. Searle J. R. (1979) Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. 187p.
8. Searle J. R. (1975) Indirect speech acts. Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press. P. 59-82.
9. Wunderlich D. (1976) Studien zur Sprechakttheorie. Frankfurt a. Main: Suhrkamp. 416 p.