ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ

УДК 81'1

Бирюк И.Б.
доцент Могилевского государственного университета имени А.А. Кулешова
Могилев, Беларусь

РЕЧЕВЫЕ АКТЫ ОТКАЗА: ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается актуальное направление современного исследования языка – лингвистическая прагматика. На примере речевого акта отказа проводится прагматический анализ негативных реактивных актов с подключением таких параметров, как коммуникативная цель, концепция говорящего и собеседника, событийное содержание, фактор коммуникативного прошлого и будущего, языковое воплощение.

Ключевые слова: прагматический анализ, теория речевых актов, речевые акты негативной реакции, эксплицитное выражение негации, имплицитное выражение негации.

Biryuk I.B.
Assistant Professor at Mogilev State A. Kuleshov University
Mogilev, Belarus

THE SPEECH ACT OF REFUSAL: PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

Abstract. The article considers a topical trend of current language research - linguistic pragmatics. The pragmatic analysis of negative reactive acts is exemplified by the analysis of the speech act of refusal. Such factors as a communicative goal, concepts of the interlocutors, a current content, a factor of the communicative past and future, as well as their linguistic expression are taken into account.

Key words: pragmatic analysis, the theory of speech acts, verbal acts of negative reaction, explicit and implicit expression of negation.

Today man is in the spotlight of all scientific fields. And linguistics in this sense is no exception. Linguists turned to a "human factor", to a native speaker at the end of the 19th centuries, when a new linguistic theory, aimed at interpreting speech activity was born. Interest was directed to the field of speech communication with pragmatic impact, and pragmatics as a brunch of science came to the forefront of linguistic research.

The founder of pragmatics is Charles Pierce. However, the term "pragmatics" was introduced into scientific use by Pierce's most famous follower in the field of semiotics Charles Morris. Pragmatics has been understood as the study of meaning in context, or the meaning of linguistic units, arising in the process of their use.

The theory of pragmatic analysis was developed in the works of G.P. Grice, B. Russell, L. Wittgenstein, M. Frege. It was Grice who drew attention to the analysis of non-literal meanings of expressions and found that an addressee with linguistic competence is able to understand that the speaker's intention differs from the meaning of the utterance [1].

For a long time, the speech act has served as a unit of pragmatic analysis. The object of research in the theory of speech acts is the act of speech, that is, the statement of the speaker, addressed to the listener in a particular situation of communication; a purposeful speech action performed in accordance with the principles and rules of speech behavior adopted in the society.

A significant contribution to the theory of speech communication was made by American linguists K. Pike and E. Sapir, who first raised the issue of language learning through the prism of speech behavior. However, the strongest impetus for

the formation of the theory of speech activity was given in the works of J. Austin and J. Searle. In the mid-50s of the 20th century J. Austin, a British linguist and philosopher, introduced the theory of speech acts, which was later published as a course of lectures titled *How To Do Things With Words* (1962) [2]. Subsequently, this theory continued its development in the works of J. Searle and P.F. Strawson, American and British logicians, and a little later in numerous studies of European, American and Russian linguists. In Russian linguistics the pragmatic approach was developed by M.M. Bakhtin (theory of utterance), V.N. Voloshinov (theory of speech interaction), A.N. Leontiev and L.S. Vygotsky (theory of speech activity).

Thus, J. Austin believes that in order to study direct speech interaction, one should resort to the dialogical form of communication, which will determine the processes of speech generation and perception. In this case, the unit of communication will no longer be a sentence or statement, but the actual speech act. He distinguishes locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts [2].

P.F. Strawson, summarizing the research of J. Austin, states that it is an illocutionary act that serves as the minimum unit in the process of communication, which differs from the locutionary act on the basis of intentionality (the presence of a specific goal or intention), and it is opposed to the perlocutionary act by virtue of conventionality (the presence of certain rules that ensure the successful implementation of an illocutionary act) [4, c. 113-114].

Among the most difficult situations to perceive in the course of speech interaction there are speech acts of negative reaction. A speech situation of negative reaction, or a speech act of negation, is understood as the act that expresses the negative attitude of the speaker to the action or statement of the interlocutor, which is an informative, evaluative or imperative statement with different emotional shades (judgment, disapproval, etc.) and having a certain embodiment in speech. Speech acts of negative reaction usually include such speech situations as disagreement, prohibition and refusal [3].

The speech act of disagreement is one of the types of reactive speech acts of negative response, reflecting the position of the speaker, opposite to the position of the interlocutor and is made in the form of objection, disapproval, refutation, condemnation, negative evaluation of the communicator, etc., each of which has its specific communicative purpose.

The speech act of prohibition may be defined as a speech act of negative reaction that combines the meaning of prohibition and motivation, in which the speaker does not allow to perform or demands to stop the action already begun by the time of speech, since he believes that this action should not happen in the current situation.

The speech act of refusal is a speech act of negative reaction, arising in response to a request, demand or order of the interlocutor, in which the speaker does not have the ability or desire to perform the required action.

The basis for speech acts of negative reaction with different shades of meaning is explicit and implicit lexico-grammatical negation.

Explicitly expressed negation in speech acts derives from the literal content of the utterance, and the communicator's intention is presented clearly and unequivocally. While the implicit way of expressing negation, as a rule, is characteristic of indirect speech acts, in which there is a split between the meaning and the form of the utterance. The speaker performs one speech act, but uses another. In addition, the communicator transmits more information, since he is counting on the totality of the addressee's knowledge and on his ability to draw consistent conclusions from the above [3].

Thus, analyzing acts of negative reaction, it was revealed that they were performed by interlocutors to achieve various communicative goals, and various methods of their realization were chosen and appropriate language means were used. These can be provided by the analysis of speech acts of refusal on the material of R. Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451.

In the process of communication, the speech act of refusal arises from the preceding statements of the addresser (A1), who uses a variety of linguistic means in order to influence the recipient (A2). The pragmatic purpose of A2 is to present a rejection of request made in saying of A1.

Generally, the structure of a dialogue with a speech act of refusal has the following form: 1. A1 - speech act of motivation → 2. A2 - speech act of rejecting request, demand or proposal → 3. A1 - requesting justification for refusal → 4. A2 - refusal justification. However, in the process of communication, there is often an incomplete implementation of this scheme. The most common are dialogues with steps 1 and 2.

The dominant language means of implementing speech situations of refusal in English are the pronoun *no* and the negative particle *not*, which is added to the auxiliary or modal verb. Besides, different means of expressing indirect speech acts of refusal are widely used when the speaker sets a goal not to offend the participant of the speech interaction with his refusal.

A speech situation in which the addressee rejects advice is often supported by arguments for whatever reason he does not want or cannot follow the advice offered, for example:

*"Sometimes I drive all night and come back and you don't know it. It's fun out in the country. You hit rabbits, sometimes you hit dogs. **Go take the beetle**."*

*"**No, I don't want to, this time**. I want to hold on to this funny thing. God, it's gotten big on me."* [5, с. 84]

Sometimes speech acts of refusal express a sincere or ironic assessment of the advice offered by the interlocutor:

"Hey", said Clarisse, "you might really succeed if you take up it."

*"**Don't be silly**, writing is just a hobby."* [5, c. 56]

It should be noted that the rejection of advice is rarely supplied with speech formulas of apology, regret, gratitude, etc. In order to make refusing point-blank less categorical a statement can be implemented in the form of a request with *will (would)*:

He caught her shrieking. He kept her and she tried to fight away from him, scratching.

"No, Millie, no! Wait! Stop it, will you?" [5, c. 86]

The next type of rejection is the refusal of an invitation which is often accompanied by reasons due to which performing an action seems impossible. This may include busyness (*to be busy*), circumstances beyond the addressee's control (*have to do smth / I must*), lack of time (*for lack of time/to be short of time*), fatigue (*to be tired*) or a counter offer to take the invitation in future (*another time / some other time*). The above mentioned means of expression are normally used in indirect speech acts of refusal.

In the cited microdialogue the speaker does not want to accept the invitation, and the refusal is expressed explicitly with further explanation:

*"Come on, let's be cheery, you turn the 'family' on, now. Go ahead. **Let's laugh and be happy, now, stop crying, we'll have a party!"***

"No," said Mrs. Bowles. *"**I'm trotting right straight home. You want to visit my house and 'family', well and good. But I won't come in this fireman's crazy house again in my lifetime!"*** [5, c. 131]

Refusal of the offer can be realized with the help of positive or negative assessment of the proposed action or personal contribution to this action with an explanation following next:

*"**Don't you have the urge to be a father?"** she coaxed.*

*"**I don't know."***

*"**You're joking!"***

"I mean..." He stopped and shook his head. *"**Well, my wife, she . . . she just never wanted any children at all.**"* [5, c. 40]

An offer on the part of the addresser can be contrasted with the alternative statement of the addressee:

"I'll take you in the car," he said in a small voice.

*"**I'll walk, thank you.**"* [5, c. 60]

However, if the addressee cannot accept the offer for any reason, he rejects it with a subsequent explanation:

Montag placed his hand on the woman's elbow. "You can come with me."

"No," she said. *"**Thank you,** anyway. **I want to stay here.**"* [5, c. 53]

It is important to state that the English speech portrait is characterized by politeness, so the addressee is forced to resort to the use of speech formulas of regret

(*unfortunately*), apology (*sorry*), as well as thanks (*thanks*) in speech acts of refusal to requests and invitations:

"Then, turn on your lawn sprinklers as high as they'll go and hose off the sidewalks. With any luck at all, we can kill the trail in here, anyway…"

"I'll tend to it. Good luck. If we're both in good health, next week, the week after, get in touch. General Delivery, St. Louis. **I'm sorry there's no way** *I can go with you this time, by ear-phone."* [5, с. 175]

Refusal to provide the requested information can be expressed without any argument, and sometimes even in a rude manner:

"How many copies of Shakespeare and Plato?"

*"****None!*** *You know as well as I do.* ***None!****"* [5, с. 99]

A common reaction of a rejection speech situation to a question is a counter-question, when the addressee does not want to answer and applies the evasion tactics:

She watched his lips casually. "What about last night?"

"Don't you remember?"

*"****What?*** *Did we have a wild party or something?"* [5, с. 28]

The evasion tactics can be realized with the help of the passive voice, which presents the action expected of the addressee not as his immediate duty, but as a generally accepted rule, the need for which is obvious. This form of expressing refusal has a less categorical meaning and allows you to avoid the pressure exerted on the interlocutor:

"The TV channel in this book, this play, this TV serial aren't meant to be any actual painters, cartographers, mechanics anywhere." [5, с. 75]

Sometimes the addresser, showing excessive interest or curiosity in the process of communication, faces negative assessment of his speech behavior or actions from the position of the addressee:

"My uncle drove slowly on a highway once. He drove forty miles an hour and they jailed him for two days. Isn't that funny, and sad, too?"

"You think too many things*," said Montag, uneasily* [5 с. 16].

Very often the reluctance or impossibility to answer a communicator's question comes down to a change in the topic of conversation:

"You are an odd one," he said, looking at her. "Haven't you any respect?"

"I don't mean to be insulting. It's just, I love to watch people too much, I guess."

"Well, doesn't this mean anything to you?" *He tapped the numerals 451 stitched on his charcoloured sleeve.*

*"****Yes,****" she whispered. She increased her pace.* ***"Have you ever watched the jet cars racing on the boulevards down that way?"***

"You're changing the subject!" [5, с. 16]

To sum up, refusal is directly related to explicit and implicit negation. Implicit speech acts of refusal are realized by such tactics as changing the topic of the conversation, evaluating speech actions of the interlocutor, counter questions, counter offers. A prerequisite for a successful implicit speech act of refusal is mutual awareness of communicants, which is reflected not only in the concept of the speaker, but also in that of the interlocutor. Speech acts of refusal often involve the use of speech etiquette formulas (*unfortunately, sorry, thank you*) characteristic of the English speech portrait.

The speech act of negative reaction is characterized by the following parameters: the communicative purpose, the concepts of the speaker and the interlocutor, eventful content, the factor of the communicative past and future, as well as the linguistic means of expression. The main communicative purpose of speech acts of refusal is the rejection of a request, demand or proposal.

The speech act is the minimum unit of pragmatic analysis, whose task is to study the situational use of language in the process of communication. Language users have certain social experience of using it. So, only language community may determine the requirements for operating with language means in the process of communication.

References

1. *Грайс Г.П. Логика и речевое общение [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: http://kant.narod.ru/grice.htm. Дата доступа: 30.05.2018.*

2. *Austin J.L. How to do things with words. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962. 166 p.*

3. *Horn Laurence R. A natural history of negation [Electronic resource]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. 637 p. Mode of access: http://emilkirkegaard.dk/en/wp-content/uploads/A-natural-history-of-negation-Laurence-R.-Horn.pdf Date of access: 05.03.2018.*

4. *Strawson P.F. «Austin and 'Locutionary Meaning» in Essays on J. L. Austin. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973. 171 p.*

5. *Bradbury Ray. Fahrenheit 451. New York: Harper Voyager, 2013. 240 p.*