The article elucidates the reasons of the violation of communicaive maxims under the impact of the negative emotions. Special attention is drawn to the character of tonality, raising tone and also the diversity of the communicative intentions of the speakers. In conclusions it finds out the reasons of violation communicative principles in English dialogues under the impact of negative emotions. It distinguishes the types of tonality.

Key words: conflict, maxim, tonality, emotionalizm.

VERBALIZATION OF INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT IN FICTION

Paronyan Sh.A., Bekaryan L.A.,
Yerevan State University,
British Consulate in Armenia

The article is devoted to the analysis of the linguistic peculiarities of conflict talk in Modern English fiction. Conflict discourse is seen as a type of verbal behaviour which has its specific model of development in speech. The paper one of the situational types of interpersonal conflict discourse – family conflict and looks into the pragmalinguistic mechanism of its unfolding in fiction. The authors of the article believe that the writer is a speaker who uses his / her own communicative competence when verbalizing contradiction of the fictional heroes. Similarly, the reader is an interpreter who uses these skills when interpreting the contradictory interaction of the fictional characters. The results of the research work can be used for the elaboration of language strategies and tactics which will enable speakers to carry out a productive exchange of opposing opinions in real-life speech events and avoid disruptive and hostile social relationships.

Key words: conflict discourse, interpersonal conflict, communicative competence, social relationships.

It is well known that in our daily life average communication skills are not enough. Thus, when we have a conversation with a friend, an employee or a prospective client, we tend to make our communication meaningful, full of impact and successful. Moreover, in our busy social life we strive for cooperation everywhere and try to sustain civilised and relaxed relationships with our partners. The establishment of social ties is done through speech – a rule-governed form of social behaviour which is regulated by certain social rules, maxims, as well as sequencing rules. The distinction of interactional and transactional functions of speech in Discourse Analysis comes to prove that language is not only an instrument for communicating, imparting information but also a powerful means for creating one's social environment – friends, colleagues, acquaintances, relatives, etc. [3; 9]. As is well known, social relationships necessarily embrace two opposite poles – cooperation and contradiction. Unfortunately, social life is becoming tenser and tenser, and the general predisposition to oppositional behaviour in human society has grown. That is why the problem of contradictory interaction has become quite actual in Pragmatics recently. In as much as arguments, quarrels, rows or fights form an essential part of our conversational practice, they are abundant in novels, stories, plays, film scenarios written by individual writers. As a matter of fact, we suppose that the account of interpersonal conflict of the heroes is part of the writers' fictional techniques which is based on their own personal experience as speakers – users of language. Therefore, writers present the contradictory discourse of the fictional heroes the way they see it as speakers. In doing so, they put their own communicative competence into use. Similarly, readers also interpret the piece of verbal interaction as conflict, resorting to their own communicative competence. After all, it is rarely signalled, nominated in a piece of writing that the heroes are quarrelling, arguing, and so on: the authors just verbalize the speech event as they see it, adapting the speech of the heroes both to the contextual parameters of the ongoing conversation, and to their individual skills as creators of conflict discourse. The readers, in their turn, do not fail to "decipher" the verbal, and, also non-verbal display of contradiction of the heroes and, in doing so, they also resort both to context and to their own experience. This fact comes to prove that in certain cases fictional speech can be used to create models of real-life speech events. Hence the present paper is an attempt to look deeply into

the nature of human contradiction expressed through verbal tokens and try to identify the principal communicative types of verbal collision in Modern English. Undoubtedly, our ultimate aim in this type of analysis is to work out language strategies and tactics that will enable speakers to avoid disruptive and hostile relationships with speaking partners, to avert opposition in social life and hold amicable and polite conversation, resulting in communicative success and full appreciation.

In a determined attempt to claim our opinion, to satisfy our needs, or to prove our point in the process of communication, we frequently get involved in conflict – an activity that prevents, blocks the realization of our communicative goals, or interferes with the effectiveness of conversing. Undoubtedly, conflicts make an inevitable part of human relationships and can be as small as disagreement or as large as war [7].

In fact, any healthy relationship may fail as a result of contradictory interaction (conflict talk, conflict discourse as it is also called), arising from unpleasant emotions, barriers in communication, negative disposition or misunderstanding. Conflict-based interaction may sometimes unfold to such extent that, unwilling to rectify the tense and explosive situation, the interlocutors turn the communication setting into a battle arena, where words become weapons and negative emotions are expressed through violent verbal and non-verbal behaviour. No wonder, in such cases the expression "Sticks and stones may break my bones" (but words will never hurt me) does not seem to work at all!

The analyses of conversational practice lead to the conclusion that conflicts play a crucial role in social interactions and, therefore, the study of verbal as well as non-verbal markers of contradictory interaction is quite important in Pragmatics [8; 5]. Hence, the vast amount of research work on conflict theory tends to show that conflict and adverse relations have become the subject of various disciplines like social psychology, politics, religion, management, linguistics, etc. Admittedly, as a concept conflict can help explain many aspects of life, such as social tensions, everyday quarrels, political disputes, etc. Thus, recently it has become actual to speak about the so-called ethnolinguistic conflicts where not people but languages are involved in confrontation, religious conflicts, based on faith rather than reason, virtual conflicts erupted by hostile and aggressive messages posted on the Internet, etc. [10; 6].

A series of extensive research on human behaviour from the perspective of social psychology revealed two opposite types of contradictory behaviour – internal and external conflicts [1; 2]. As the name itself suggests, internal conflict is a mental psychological struggle that develops within the human being, his / her inner self. Resulting from oppositions that arise between simultaneous but incompatible desires, needs, drives, or impulses, this type of conflict is often unconscious and is not usually expressed in the speech behaviour of the individuals.

External conflict, on the contrary, is an explicit struggle between at least two interdependent parties who, guided by opposite motives, opinions or needs, pursue incompatible goals and, thus prove a hindrance to each other. In their turn, external conflicts can be interpersonal or intergroup. Interpersonal conflict *is a type of antagonism that reflects dissonance between individual humans*, whereas intergroup conflict suggests disparity between or among social, ethnic, professional, and other groups of people because of their irreconcilable strategies, negative predispositions or annoying and inconsiderate behaviour. *However, both sociologists and linguists tend to focalize interpersonal conflict which may include various contradictory speech events – family conflict, classroom conflict, antisocial or aggressive behaviour at work, peer antagonism, etc.*

Paradoxically, many researchers claim that the probability of contradictory verbal behaviour increases along with the growth of intensity of human bonds that connect the speaking partners [4]. As it is, the more committed one is to his / her interlocutor, the higher the probability of verbal dueling is. The members of the same family are involved in emotionally close and, at the same time, diverse relationships. Furthermore, in family settings people are relatively sincere in expressing their emotions (positive or negative), thoughts, and feelings. Truly enough, one might feel a bit uneasy to contradict his / her interlocutor explicitly in public places, for fear of being deprived of one's status, power, authority, work or salary. Meanwhile, when conflicting with a family member, one might not fear the above-mentioned consequences and may express his / her disagreement or disapproval overtly. That is why in order to reveal the characteristic linguistic patterns of conflict talk, we decided to conduct an analysis of family conflict situations. Admittedly, studying conflict talk in English was a difficult task for us. Firstly, English is rarely used in Armenian family settings. Secondly, it is very difficult to witness and record family conflicts (even in Armenian!), since the presence of an "outsider" makes it difficult for the natural and spontaneous outburst of negative emotions and disruptive verbal behaviour. Thus, bearing in mind that the author's description of interpersonal conflict in fiction is a speaker's account of his / her own communicative compe-

tence as well as life experience, the samples of family conflict have been retrieved from fabricated linguistic material – modern English plays and films.

As already stated, interpersonal conflict may result from the interlocutors' incompatible goals, clash of opinions, negative disposition, or various communicative barriers. Constituted on disjunctive emotions, interpersonal conflicts tend to disjoin the interlocutors, forcing them to break the established norms of civil communication and build contradictory interaction patterns.

As our research into contradictory interaction patterns shows, some conflict-ridden interpersonal situations may arise spontaneously, due to the incompatible temperaments of the conflicting parties, their irritable disposition or bad mood, whereas others may be initiated by the readiness of one of the parties to get involved in confrontation. Hence, some unpleasant past event recalled by one of the partners may have an unplanned negative effect on the ongoing conversation, impelling one of the interlocutors to act in a particular way – disagree, argue, quarrel, etc. In this respect, we would like to distinguish between spontaneous conflict that arises impulsively, with no apparent provocation, and instigated conflict, that is, conflict caused by certain external factors which are activated in the process of interaction.

Interestingly enough, spontaneous conflict is particularly inherent in parent-child settings, where the interlocutors do not have equal rights in interaction because of their social roles and power. This type of contradictory interaction may arise because of the unwillingness of the younger generation to comply with the demands, requests of their parents.

The following exchange is an example of spontaneous conflict talk which develops due to the unwillingness of the daughter to meet her mother's expectations. The daughter opposes her mother overtly, without trying to use hedges or even hesitation markers which mitigate the illocutionary force of the speech act:

M r s . B i r l i n g : *You're looking tired, dear.* **I think you ought to go to bed – and forget about this absurd business.** *You'll feel better in the morning.*
S h e i l a : **Mother, I couldn't possibly go.** *Nothing could be worse for me. We've settled all that. I'm staying here until I know why that girl killed herself.*
M r s . B i r l i n g : *Nothing but morbid curiosity.*
S h e i l a : **No, it isn't.**
M r s . B i r l i n g : **Please don't contradict me like that.** *And in any case I don't suppose for a moment that we can understand why the girl committed suicide.* [P.I.C.: 316–317]

As we shall see in the following example, instigated conflict may rest upon the negative impact of some unpleasant past event which displays itself in the process of communication as negative predisposition:

T o m : *Yesterday you confiscated my books! You had the nerve to –.*
A m a n d a : *I took that* **horrible** *novel back to the library – yes! That* **hideous** *book by that* **insane** *Mr. Lawrence. (Tom laughs wildly.) I cannot control the output of* **diseased minds** *or people who cater to them – (Tom laughs still more wildly.)* **BUT I WON'T ALLOW SUCH FILTH BROUGHT INTO MY HOUSE!** *No, no, no, no, no!*
T o m : *House, house! Who pays rent on it, who makes a slave of himself to –.*
A m a n d a : **(fairly screeching)** *Don't you* **DARE** *to – .* [W.G.M.: 1967, 51–452]

In this exchange the author has verbalized conflict talk between a mother and a son. Tom initiates an argument with Amanda, his mother, who has taken one of his books back to the library. As we can see, in an attempt to oppose Tom and justify her actions, Amanda refers to the book and its author with descriptive adjectives that possess a good deal of negative emotive charge: *horrible, hideous, insane.* The demonstrative pronoun *that* is used deliberately, in order to denote a kind of psychological distance between the speakers. Thus, as if trying to underscore her negative attitude towards the author and his writing, Amanda refers to the book as *that* **horrible** *novel* and *that* **hideous** *book* and to its author as *that* **insane** *Mr. Lawrence.* One of the most important factors in conducting conflict talk is the problem of authority. Hence, if we judge from the perspective of status and age, Amanda is obviously the person to be endowed with power in the family. As shown by the author, the exclamatory utterance *"BUT I WON'T ALLOW SUCH FILTH BROUGHT INTO MY HOUSE!"* is pronounced with a special emphasis on negative emotional attitude and comes to prove this fact. On the other hand, the expression of irony in Tom's exclamatory speech, *"House, house!"* and his rhetorical questions, *"Who pays rent on it, who makes a slave of himself -"* make it clear that Amanda depends on her son financially. This fact, undoubtedly, accounts for the aggressive tone and bold-on-record manner Tom has adopted when arguing with

his mother. Since this is family conflict, the mother strongly believes that financial independence does not empower her son to nag at her and she shouts back at him, making a loud high unpleasant sound (as described by the author "fairly screeching"). As we can see in this example, the author gives an account of both *verbal* (words describing negative attitude, exclamation marks, tone of voice, capital letters) and *non-verbal* (laughter, voice quality) markers of conflict talk.

The ability of conducting conflict talk appropriately may be regarded as a kind of verbal art, requiring enough competence and proficiency. Were people aware of their aggressive behaviour or offensive words they deploy when conflicting, they would definitely think twice before coming into conflict! On the other hand, one has to admit that in some contradictory speech situations, where the tension is quite high, nerves are overstrained and the pitch of negative emotions is extremely high, one can find it very difficult to restrain oneself from violent gestures, aggressive behaviour and distasteful words in speech. Therefore, it seems natural that the expressive level of contradictory interaction, that is, the verbal and non-verbal behaviour patterns of the conflicting parties may vary. In view of this, we propose to distinguish between explicit and implicit types of contradictory interaction.

Like spontaneous conflicts, explicit conflicts are mostly common to family relations based on subordination, such as *parent – child* or, sometimes, *husband – wife* interaction. The verbal patterns of explicit contradictory interaction are generally marked by the author with openly expressed disagreement on part of the speakers. Hence, the explicit verbal conflict usually consists in an exchange of insults, threats, name-callings, different types of verbal abuse and even hostile non-verbal actions, etc. Our analysis has revealed the following communicative-semantic types of explicit contradictory interaction, inherent in family conflict settings: **disagreement, contradiction, wrangle, scuffle** and **row** [7]. In this paper we shall show the linguistic mechanism of some of the above-mentioned types of conflict talk. Let us first examine a case of contradiction which takes place between husband and wife:

G e o r g e : *What are you doing?*
O l i v i a : *Making curtains, George. Won't they be rather sweet? Oh, but I forgot – you don't like them.*
G e o r g e : **I don't like them**, *and what is more,* **I don't mean** *to have them in my house. As I told you yesterday, this is the house of a simple country gentleman, and* **I don't want** *any of these new-fangled ideas in it.*   [B.K.M.: 319–320]

Predicting George's critical opinion of her curtains, Olivia tries to secure his approval by establishing an atmosphere of closeness and intimacy with her husband. That is why she addresses him with the question tag "*Won't they be rather sweet?*" which indirectly requests his support. Olivia's communicative strategy fails, since, in an attempt to maintain his power, George withdraws from cooperation and opposes his wife openly. This is done through sharp personalization of speech where George displays explicit disinterest in his wife's opinion. At the same time, the recurrent usage of the negative emphatic constructions "*I don't like*", "*I don't mean*", "*I don't want*" expresses his negative feelings for his wife's actions.

The notion of reciprocity may also account for the development of explicit conflict in the process of interaction. As we shall see in the following example of a **row**, in order to save face or to stop the speaker's further attacks, the interlocutor is compelled to react to the act of aggression correspondingly:

G o r d o n : *(excitedly, and rushing over to Stanton with threatening gestures) Then you're* **a rotten swine**, *Stanton.* **I don't care** *about the money. But you let Martin take the blame. You let everybody think he was a thief.*
S t a n t o n : **Don't be such a hysterical young fool.** *(pushing Gordon away)*   [P.I.C.: 377]

As we can see, the author gives an account of both verbal and non-verbal markers of contradictory interaction. The description of the gestures, movements, voice qualities of the characters contributes to the interpretation of the interaction as conflict.

In many speech situations the authors describe conflicting parties who tend to be very careful in their selection of verbal and non-verbal cues, trying to contribute to relatively smooth and civil development of contradictory interaction. In such situations both the interlocutors avoid overt clashes and harsh encounters and get engaged in implicit verbal duel. Our analysis comes to prove that in this type of confrontation, the communicative tension is moderately low, since the speech of the characters is relatively polite: the authors are more careful in their word choice and do not express the negative disposition of the speakers with the help of direct illocutionary acts – accusations, threats, reproaches, and complaints. Accordingly, they build contradictory utterances with the help of conditionals and certain constructions, such as,

"*I wish + that*", "*why not*", which express accusation, complaint or reproach indirectly and, thus, soften the negative effect of these speech acts.

An instance of indirect reproach performed with the help of conditional mood is illustrated in the following example of **disagreement**:

A n g e l a :   *If I could work I'd be in the English factories.*
M a l a c h y :   *Malachy: A factory's not a place for a woman.*   [A.A.]

When analysing this exchange, it is important to take into consideration some extralinguistic factors of the communicative situation. The actual time of the interaction in the film "Angela's Ashes" is the beginning of the 20th century, known as a period in history when men maintained dominance in families, and women were supposed to stay home and raise children. Angela is displeased with her family life, since her husband does not want to work to support the family. At the same time, she does not want to arouse her husband's anger by expressing her opinion overtly, and tries to communicate her discontent in an indirect and more polite manner. That is why, the author uses Conditional Mood in Angela's speech which expresses some unreal desire concerning her own future actions and, at the same time, criticises the husband who abstains from work. Hence, Angela's utterance "*If I could work I'd be in the English factories*" implies that her husband should work but he does not. However, Malachy is not challenged by Angela's critical attitude, since he feels that he might not be able to make successful face-saving acts. Therefore, in Malachy's speech the communicative focus of the interaction is diverted deliberately to the problem of moral norms: he goes on to discuss certain norms accepted by the society in general: "*A factory's not a place for a woman*". This language strategy enables Malachy to create a kind of defensive atmosphere and diminishes the tension of the communicative situation.

Further research into the implicit conflict talk patterns allows us to identify a subtype of implicit conflict, which we propose to call **situational conflict**, where only the interlocutors themselves perceive the antagonism of the particular interactional pattern. The perception of the implied contradiction highly relies on background knowledge that reflects some past events, facts and experiences shaping one's life and help to understand why the particular events are taking place. The decoding of this type of conflict by the reader is largely context-dependent and needs a good deal of mental work. Let us consider the following exchange that takes place between mother and her son:

M a r y :   *(tensely) Why do you stare like that?*
J a m i e :   *You know. (He turns back to the window.)*
M a r y :   *I don't know.*
J a m i e :   *Oh, for God's sake, do you think you can fool me, Mama? I'm not blind.*
M a r y :   *(Looks directly at him now, her face set again in an expression of blank, stubborn denial.) I don't know what you're talking about.*
J a m i e :   *No? Take a look at your eyes in the mirror!*   [N.L.D.J.N: 48]

Having been compelled to undergo drug dependence treatment by her family, the mother is trying to assure her relatives that she has quit using drugs. Anyhow, Jamie, her son, who knows quite well the way she looks and behaves when she is affected by the narcotic, suspects her of abusing drugs secretly. The reason for negative interpretation of Mary's behaviour is not mentioned overtly: "*You know – I don't know*"; "*I'm not blind – I don't know what you're talking about*". Meanwhile the author's descriptive remarks reveal the negative attitude of the speakers to one another: the way they speak – tensely; the way they look – stare, express "blank, stubborn denial"; their movements – Jamie turns his back to Mary. The mother denies her son's accusations silently, and the latter understands the illocutionary force of the indirect speech act which makes him angry and more aggressive than ever. This fact accounts for Jamie's seemingly odd behaviour towards his mother and the emotionally coloured directive speech act addressed to her: "*No? Take a look at your eyes in the mirror!*"

Thus the author, who is also a speaker, applies his communicative competence through the speech of his characters, description of their behaviour, facilitating the interpretation of the piece of writing by the reader as conflict talk.

Having analysed the display of contradictory verbal behaviour in speech, we conclude that conflict is an inescapable part of our social life, language, culture and it might seem impossible to avoid it. On the other hand, the word conflict itself does not necessarily imply bombs in Iraq, Nagorno-Karabakh issue, family scandals, harsh words or aggression. Conflicting may be regarded as a kind of a tool or language technique which, if used constructively, can resolve the disparities between two parties. No wonder, many cultures regard conflicting as a pleasurable sign of intimacy, since it enables the oppositional speaking partners

to tell each other the unsaid, to sound the unheard and to reveal the unthinkable. One thing is for sure: the most dangerous weapon that has ever been created by mankind and against mankind is the word. Words can injure one's soul more severely than any other weapon; words can destroy human relationships more easily than an atomic bomb can! Words are mighty and treacherous because their power is inconspicuous and the final effect is remarkably invisible for users. Words are weapons we always carry on us, and there are no laws banning their use, no strategic defence companies aimed at peaceful realization of words! So we speak out our minds freely – without controlling the degree of the harmful effect of our utterances. Fortunately or unfortunately, there is no other weapon against words but... words themselves. No strategic plans can be worked out to keep us away from conflicting, only simple words of affection and friendship. Hence this article might be considered as an attempt of language strategy whose aim is to control human behaviour by stressing the negative sides of conflicting: think twice before shooting at your interlocutor with words!

Thus, apparently, should the conflicting parties realize the simple fact that they might benefit more through civilized argumentative interaction, they would admit that a family and, after all, human society is not an arena for battles but a rich site where discussion, a productive exchange of opinions or negotiations can provide communicative success and achieve more effect than aggression, antagonism or offensive words can.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Андреева Г.М. Социальная психология/ Галина Андреева .– М. : Наука, 1980. – 415 с.
2. Гришина Н.В. Психология конфликта/ Наталья Гришина. – М. : СПб, 2004. – 464 с.
3. Brown G., Yule G. Discourse Analysis/ Gillian Brown, George Yule. – Cambridge, CUP, 1983. – 283 p.
4. Holmes J.G., Murray S.L. Conflict in Close Relationship/Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles/ John Holmes, Sandra Murray. – New York, London, The Guilford Press, 1996. – P. 622–654.
5. Kakava Ch. Discourse and Conflict// Handbook of Discourse Analysis/ Christina Kakava. – Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2003. – P. 650–671.
6. Nelde P.H. Research on Language Conflict, Sociolinguistics/ International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society/ Peter Nelde. – Berlin, N.Y., Walter de Gruyter, 1987. – 185 p.
7. Paronyan Sh., Bekaryan L. The Verbal Expression of Interpersonal Conflict in Modern English (in Armenian)//Foreign Languages in High School. Collected Articles. – N 8/ Shushanik Paronyan, Lilit Bekaryan. – Yerevan, YSU Publishing House, 2007. – P. 98–107.
8. Paronyan Sh. On the Linguistic Expression of Uncertainty through Hesitation Markers in Conflict Talk in English// Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В.Н. Каразина. – N 866. – Випуск 59/ Shushanik Paronyan. – Харків, 2009. – C. 92–98.
9. Widdowson H.G. Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis/Henry Widdowson. – Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2004. – 179 p.
10. Zupnik Y.J. Conversational Interruptions in Israeli-Palestinian 'Dialogue' Events// Discourse Studies. – Vol.2. – N1/ Yael-Janette Zupnik. – Sage Publications. – P. 85–110.

ИСТОЧНИКИ ИЛЛЮСТРАТИВНОГО МАТЕРИАЛА

11. [A.A.] – Angela's Ashes, "David Brown Productions", 2000.
12. [B.K.M.] – Bennett A., Knoblock E. Milestones// Sixteen Famous British Plays/Arnold Bennett, Edward Knoblock. – New York, Random House, Inc, 1942. – 1000 p.
13. [N.L.D.J.N.] – O'Neill E. Long Day's Journey into Night//Three American Plays/Eugene O'Neill. – Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1972. – 383 p.
14. [P.D.C.] – Priestley J.B. Dangerous Corner//My Six Favourite Plays/ Joseph Priestley. – New York, Stein and Day Publishers, 1979. – 406 p.
15. [P.I.C.] – Priestley J.B. An Inspector Calls//My Six Favourite Plays/ Joseph Priestley. – New York, Stein and Day Publishers, 1979. – 406 p.
16. [W.G.M.] – Williams T. The Glass Menagerie//Six Great Modern Plays/Tennessee Williams. – New York, New Dell Edition, 1967. – 512 p.

Статтю присвячено аналізу лінгвістичних особливостей міжособистісного конфлікту в англійському художньому мовленні. Конфліктний дискурс розглядається як мовленнєва діяльність, яка має специфічну модель розгортання у мовленні. На основі цього зроблено спробу виробити мовленнєвий механізм протікання конфліктної інтеракції. Особлива увага приділяється сімейному конфлікту,

досліджується прагмалінгвістична модель цього типу спілкування. Результати цього дослідження можуть використовуватися при виробленні лінгвістичних стратегій і тактик, що дозволяють мовцям здійснювати продуктивний обмін протилежними думками, уникаючи підривних мовленнєвих впливів і ворожих людських взаємовідносин.

Ключові слова: *конфліктний дискурс, міжособистісний конфлікт, комунікативна компетенція, соціальні взаємовідносини.*

Статья посвящена анализу лингвистических особенностей межличностного конфликта в английской художественной речи. Конфликтный дискурс рассматривается как речевая деятельность, имеющая специфическую модель развертывания в речи. На основе этого делается попытка выработать речевой механизм протекания конфликтной интеракции. Особое внимание уделяется семейному конфликту, исследуется прагмалингвистическая модель данного типа общения. Результаты данного исследования можно использовать при выработке лингвистических стратегий и тактик, позволяющих говорящим совершать продуктивный обмен противоположных мнений, избегая подрывных речевых действий и враждебных человеческих взаимоотношений.

Ключевые слова: *конфликтный дискурс, межличностный конфликт, коммуникативная компетенция, социальные взаимоотношения.*

ПОЛІКОДОВІСТЬ РЕКЛАМНОГО ТЕКСТУ ЯК МОДУЛЬНОЇ ДИСКУРСИВНОЇ ОДИНИЦІ

Мельник В.І., Швецова М.Г.,
Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка

У статті розглядається феномен полікодовості рекламного тексту як основної одиниці рекламного дискурсу; надаються ознаки полікодовості, що виражені вербальними та невербальними елементами рекламного тексту. Виокремлено ознаки полікодовості рекламного тексту як складної синтетичної структури.

Ключові слова: *медіадискурс, рекламний дискурс, полікодовий текст, когнітивний підхід.*

Рекламний текст при комплексному розгляді являє собою поєднання вербальних (текстових) компонентів та невербальних елементів (зображення, просторова організація). Тобто рекламний текст має складно-організовану структуру, основною функцією якої є інформувати / переконувати покупця / споживача послуг. Комплекс вербальних та невербальних засобів утворює полікодову модульну організацію рекламного тексту. Таким чином п р е д м е т о м нашого дослідження є ознаки такої полікодовості в рекламному тексті. Полікодовість рекламного тексту полягає у поєднанні вербальних – мовних та наочних, тобто візуальних засобів передачі потрібної інформації – за допомогою знаків, малюнків, символів та ін. Сам по собі рекламний текст – це величезна кількість прийомів, які спрямовані на здійснення покупцем певних дій. Рекламний текст же визначається як текст спрямований вплинути певним чином на аудиторію. Він бере на себе роль консультанта, виступає гарантом, підводить реципієнта до здійснення певних дій, наприклад, – купити продукт, а також формує визначене уявлення покупця про особливості товару чи послуги. Тобто реклама є продуктом людської діяльності спрямованої на поширення у широку аудиторію. Рекламу можна розглядати як форму комунікації, яка покликана перекласти якість товарів та послуг на мову потреб споживачів [7, с. 14]. Тобто рекламний текст функціонує в оточенні екстралінгвістичних факторів та має своє відображення у повсякденному житті. Тому м е т о ю нашого дослідження стало розуміння полікодової природи рекламного тексту як основної одиниці рекламного дискурсу.

Однак поняття рекламного дискурсу дотепер викликає безліч суперечок у наукових колах та досі не є визначеним однозначно. А величезний невичерпний обсяг рекламних оголошень є визначною рисою сучасного суспільства у новітній інформаційній ері. То ж а к т у а л ь н і с т ь нашого дослідження продиктована спрямованістю сучасних досліджень на комплексне вивчення явища