

UDC 811.111
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/fohium/2024.4.5>

COMMUNICATIVE-PRAGMATIC POTENTIAL OF UTTERANCES WITH THE MODALITY OF INTENTIONAL VOLITION

Yakiv Bystrov

Doctor of Philology, Professor
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University
ORCID ID 0000-0002-6549-8474
Scopus Author ID 56268636100
yakiv.bystrov@pnu.edu.ua

Nataliia Kuravska

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University
ORCID ID 0000-0002-3069-9241
natalia.kuravska@pnu.edu.ua

Diana Sabadash

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University
ORCID ID 0000-0001-8972-8003
Scopus Author ID 57209850582
Web of Science Researcher ID HJI-7010-2023

Key words: *volition, modality of volition, intentional volition, communicative-pragmatic approach, communicative-pragmatic intention, communicative-pragmatic potential, communicative situation.*

The article deals with a comprehensive analysis of utterances with modality of intentional volition and their communicative-pragmatic potential, particularly within modern British fiction. Despite a number of studies, there is still a lack of clarity in defining semantic types of intentional volition and understanding their pragmatic aspects. This study aims to investigate the underlying intentions of the speaker and how they affect the addressee in specific communicative situations by employing a communicative-pragmatic approach. In the article, the following communicative situations have been analysed: communicative situation of advice, communicative situation of suggestion, communicative situation of request, communicative situation of appeal, communicative situation of necessity, and communicative situation of invitation. These communicative situations exemplify diverse ways in which intentional volition is manifested through language, each involving distinct communicative-pragmatic intentions and eliciting varying responses from the addressee. Utterances with the modality of intentional volition, such as advice, suggestion, request, appeal, necessity, and invitation, are analysed for their characteristic features, emphasizing the importance of the addressee's autonomy in the decision-making process regarding action implementation. Various examples from modern British fiction are provided in the article to demonstrate the functioning of intentional volition in different communicative situations, which contributes to a deeper understanding of the peculiarities of the modality of intentional volition. Additionally, the study emphasizes the importance of elucidating the communicative-pragmatic potential of intentional volition in modern British fiction, which greatly enhances our understanding of literary discourse and its intricate relationship with linguistic phenomena.

КОМУНІКАТИВНО-ПРАГМАТИЧНИЙ ПОТЕНЦІАЛ ВИСЛОВЛЕНЬ ІЗ МОДАЛЬНОСТЮ ІНТЕНЦІЙНОГО ВОЛЕВІЯВЛЕННЯ

Яків Бистров

доктор філологічних наук, професор

Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника

Наталія Куравська

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника

Діана Сабадаш

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника

Ключові слова: *волевиявлення, модальність волевиявлення, інтенційне волевиявлення, комунікативно-прагматичний підхід, комунікативно-прагматична інтенція, комунікативно-прагматичний потенціал, комунікативна ситуація.*

Стаття присвячена комплексному аналізу висловлень із модальністю інтенційного волевиявлення і його комунікативно-прагматичного потенціалу в художніх текстах сучасної англійської мови. Незважаючи на низку досліджень, питання щодо визначення семантичних типів інтенційного волевиявлення й розуміння його прагматичних аспектів досі залишається недостатньо вивченим. Наше дослідження спрямоване на вивчення глибинних намірів мовця і їхнього впливу на адресата в конкретних комунікативних ситуаціях. Основою нашого дослідження є комунікативно-прагматичний підхід, який акцентує увагу на вивченні мови як засобу комунікації і її функціонування у реальних комунікативних ситуаціях. Цей підхід базується на ідеї, що мовлення є складною соціокультурною практикою, яка передбачає взаємодію між співрозмовниками й сприйняття інформації в контексті конкретної комунікативної ситуації. У статті проаналізовано такі комунікативні ситуації: комунікативна ситуація поради, комунікативна ситуація пропозиції, комунікативна ситуація прохання, комунікативна ситуація заклику, комунікативна ситуація необхідності й комунікативна ситуація запрошення. Ці комунікативні ситуації містять різні комунікативно-прагматичні інтенції й викликають різні реакції з боку адресата. У статті висловлення з модальністю інтенційного волевиявлення, такі як порада, пропозиція, прохання, заклик, необхідність, запрошення, аналізуємо з метою виокремлення їх характерних рис, акцентуючи увагу на важливості автономії адресата в процесі прийняття рішення щодо виконання дії. У статті наведено різноманітні приклади з художніх текстів сучасної британської літератури для демонстрації функціонування інтенційного волевиявлення в різних комунікативних ситуаціях, що сприяє глибшому розумінню особливостей модальності інтенційного волевиявлення. Крім того, дослідження підкреслює важливість з'ясування комунікативно-прагматичного потенціалу інтенційного волевиявлення в сучасній англійській мові, що сприяє кращому розумінню художнього дискурсу і його складного зв'язку з мовними явищами.

Introduction. In modern linguistics, there have been made multiple attempts to categorize and label utterances with the modality of volition based on specific parameters. Despite numerous studies dedicated to this problem, the question of defining semantic types of intentional volition, pragmatic aspects of the use of intentional

volition in communicative situations are still unclear.

In the article, a communicative-pragmatic analysis of utterances with modality of intentional volition is conducted, and the communicative-pragmatic intentions of the speaker in specific communicative situations and their impact on the addressee are outlined.

The relevance of the study is due to the inadequacy of the systematic description of the modality of intentional volition, as well as the communicative-pragmatic potential of utterances with the modality of intentional volition in modern British fiction.

The article is aimed at a systematic and comprehensive analysis of utterances with the modality of intentional volition, considering their communicative-pragmatic potential in modern British fiction.

Methodology. Our research is based on a communicative-pragmatic approach that emphasizes the study of language as a means of communication and its function in real communicative situations. This approach involves the use of the method of communicative-pragmatic analysis of utterances with the modality of intentional volition in order to study the semantic features of the modal meanings of intentional volition and communicative-pragmatic intentions of the speaker in specific communicative situations. The descriptive method involves the continuous fixation of utterances with the modality of intentional volition from modern British fiction, the systematization of selected utterances into groups with the identification of certain connotations. The method of contextual analysis presupposes the presence of some context in which we study and analyse the modality of intentional volition. We consider the mentioned method important for the communicative-pragmatic study of the modality of intentional volition, because it emphasizes the importance of context as the main condition for comprehending the modal meanings of intentional volition.

Results and Discussion. The utterance with the modality of intentional volition expresses actions that are optional for the addressee, but desirable for the speaker. The addressee is in a priority position when deciding whether to perform an action, which is a characteristic feature of this utterance. For example: *'And do try and appear really keen, Perdita,'* advised Sukey. *'The Committee loves enthusiasm.'* (Cooper, 1991). The characteristics of intentional volition are as follows: the addressee is not dependent on the speaker; it is up to the addressee to decide whether to perform the action; the speaker's interest in the action implementation is centred on their own benefit.

Communicative situation of advice. Since advice is a form of instruction and its communicative-pragmatic intention is to provide guidance on how to act (Мясоедова, 2001: 11), the essence of the utterance of advice is the expression of the speaker's opinion about the expediency of the addressee performing a certain action, provided that the addressee considers the action to be acceptable, or possible for them.

The utterance of advice involves the speaker expressing their opinion on what is the best for the addressee (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 82), how the addressee should act, giving them complete freedom

in making the most acceptable decision for them. By providing advice, the speaker appeals to the addressee's common sense and ability to assess the situation accurately. Accordingly, the addressee must realize that the suggested action is the most beneficial for them and should perform it. For example: *'Give these to the first person you come across, introduce yourself and see what happens,'* she advised him, then set off on her own to the kitchen (Scott, 1991). In the text provided, Maggie gives instructions to Colin. The utterance of advice expresses the intention of the speaker (Maggie) to provide the addressee (Colin) with instructions to perform / not perform an action that will be beneficial for him.

If we take into account the fact that in the communicative situation of advice the speaker who gives advice, contextually, has a higher social status than the addressee to whom the advice is given (Телеки, Шинкарук, 2007: 11), then the number of people who can give advice is considerably reduced. We believe that the speaker's priority position is based on his life experience rather than social status, i.e. the speaker (consciously or subconsciously) displays a dominant position towards the addressee and contemplates the possibility of intervening in their sphere, improving (at a communicative level) their actions, behaviour, mental reactions, etc. according to the speaker's understanding what is good for the addressee. For example: *'I advise you to put your buskins by. This is a chamber of the law'* (Fowles, 1996). In the text provided, the speaker offers the addressee to perform an action (to put buskins by), which he considers to be the most appropriate option in this situation (this is a chamber of the law). The action mentioned is beneficial for both the speaker and the addressee.

The peculiarity of the utterance of advice is that it is necessary to perform the action primarily in the interests of the addressee (Мясоедова, 2001: 11). In our opinion, the effective functioning of the utterance of advice is greatly influenced by the indication of the beneficial direction of the action on the addressee. If it is absent or its content is altered, the utterance loses the illocutionary force of advice. It is worth noting that the benefit of the action for the addressee is highly subjective: the speaker's assertion that the addressee's implementation of the action is desirable or necessary in a specific situation is based on their own opinion, which may not be accurate. For example: *'There's no need to play anything fancy,'* Otley advised. *'Just a plain ding-dong'll do.'* (Howell, 1991). In the text provided, the action suggested by the speaker (Otley) is, in his opinion, the best option in a specific situation. By using the utterance of advice, the speaker does not insist on the implementation of the action and, thus, gives the addressee the right to make a decision regarding its performing / non-performing.

Since the speaker assumes that they provide the addressee with knowledge they have but the addressee does not have (Searle, 1969: 67), the speaker grants the addressee the authority to control the situation and freely make the decision they find the most acceptable. Thus, the utterance of advice is characterized by non-obligation to perform an action: the addressee may accept the advice, or may ignore it. For example: *'But I wouldn't smoke it just yet, advised Breeze. 'Have a chocolate instead! I'm thinking of the cake – it was like a cannon-ball, wasn't it? And this can't be a very digestible cigar, because it was only four-pence.'* (Gervaise, 1983). In the text provided, the speaker (Breeze) strongly advises the addressee (Mr. Fennel) not to perform a certain action (not to smoke). The action mentioned is highly beneficial for the addressee; the speaker is interested in the addressee performing the action.

Communicative situation of suggestion. In our opinion, the utterance of suggestion communicates the speaker's intention of working together to perform the desired action, and the speaker either involves the addressee in their activity or offers assistance and wants to join the addressee. The communicative-pragmatic intention of the utterance of suggestion is to encourage the addressee to perform the action that is beneficial for the addressee (Rintell, 1979: 97), or both the speaker and the addressee. In order to perform the action, it is crucial for both the speaker and the addressee to have the desire and opportunity to do so. For example: *'Kathleen, let me tell you what I think would happen if I did as you say and then you tell me where I'm going wrong. I go into a Salvation Army hostel right, and then that's it, problem solved. What was that you said?'* (Falk, 1991). In the text provided, the speaker offers the addressee a certain action to be performed (to tell what would happen), which is beneficial for both communicants. Not only the speaker, but also the addressee is interested in the action implementation.

The speaker usually has no strong personal interest in the addressee's consent to the action; the addressee makes the decision entirely on their own. However, by expressing a suggestion, the speaker hopes that the action is not only desirable but also possible for the addressee. For example: *'Send him to a regional office?'* Rajiv offered. *'Without someone from here to look after him? Heaven forbid.'* (Neel, 1991). In the text provided, the speaker (Rajiv) assumes that the addressee (Bill Westland) not only may have sufficient desire to perform the indicated action, but also has the ability to implement this potential desire.

In general, the speaker's utterance of suggestion provides the addressee with the opportunity to perform an action that may be beneficial to both the speaker and the addressee (Edmondson, 1981: 141), or, at least, which has some rational justification and

is not capable of causing the addressee's internal rejection. For example: *'I – uh – thought we could go to the beach or something,'* he offered (Brayfield, 1990). In the text provided, the alternative to the suggested action is to stay at home, which is obviously impractical. Therefore, the addressee will not object to performing the action mentioned in the utterance of suggestion (go to the beach).

We believe that the speaker's utterance of suggestion can be aimed at achieving the following objectives:

1) demonstration of personal affection for the addressee, which is revealed by inviting the latter to participate in the action of entertaining nature: *'Do you want me to come with you and show you the way out?'* offered Endill (McDonald, 1990);

2) providing assistance to the addressee, determined by the speaker's family, friendship or official duties: *'I could go back to the house and look for it,'* he offered in desperation (Scobie, 1990).

It is important to emphasize that interrogative constructions with the meaning of "marriage proposal" compared to the majority of utterances of suggestion offer actions that are the most long-lasting and fundamental, since both communicants are expected to experience significant changes in their lives if the action is performed. For example: *'Oh, Anne, I feel free now, free to ask you to marry me. Will you, Anne, will you marry me, love?'* (Murphy, 1993). In the text provided, the potential beneficial effect of the suggested action for both communicants is not obvious due to many factors (the presence and depth of mutual sympathy and the desire to get married, readiness for family life and related responsibilities, psychosocial distance between the communicants, life circumstances, etc.).

Communicative situation of request. Since the communicative-pragmatic intention of the utterance of request is to encourage the addressee to meet the speaker's needs and desires (Мясоедова, 2001: 11), a communicative situation of request occurs when the speaker is unable or unwilling to perform a certain action and is addressing the listener, who may (but is not obliged to) perform that action. For example: *'Please, Mr Jagers,'* he begged, *'my brother is accused of stealing silver. Only you can save him! I'm ready to pay anything!'* (West & Dickens, 1992). In the text provided, the speaker requests that the addressee (Mr. Jagers) save his brother from prison. By using the utterance of request, the speaker assumes that the addressee is capable, but not obligated to perform the action (to save his brother) that is beneficial to the speaker.

The speaker of the communication situation of request is a person who does not have the opportunity to implement a certain action, so they encourage the addressee to perform it. In the communicative

situation of request, the social status, age, gender of the addressee are not crucial factors. The request is not based on the status or role characteristics of the communicants. The communicative situation of request is only limited to the speaker's understanding of the addressee's ability to do what they are asking for. For example: *'Let him go, Miss Trunchbull, please,' begged Miss Honey. 'You could damage him, you really could! You could wrench them right off'* (Dahl, 1989). In the text provided, the social statuses of the communicants are equal: they are both teachers. The speaker (Miss Honey) expresses volition aimed at the addressee (Miss Trunchbull) to perform the action (let the boy go).

It is worth mentioning that the speaker may use the utterance of request due to their internal motives (Телеки, Шинкарук, 2007: 81), which determine their communicative-pragmatic intention. The motives of the communicative situation of request are the speaker's desire for the addressee to perform a particular action. The communicative-pragmatic intention of the speaker is to change or preserve the current situation with the help of the addressee's future actions. For example: *'Examine the edger again,' he begged. 'It's all there, I tell you.'* (Cox, 1992). In the text provided, the speaker's desire is to have the edger examined. He explains his intention with the help of the utterance of request aimed at making the addressee perform the desired action for the speaker.

The following connotations of request can be distinguished depending on the source of the beneficial action:

1) request for action (the implementation of the action is aimed at the addressee of the volition): *'Oh, kind sir,' begged Gabriel, 'could you give me a pear or two, just to keep a poor old traveller from dying of hunger?'* (Aiken, 1989);

2) request for mutual action (the implementation of the action is aimed at both participants of the communicative situation): *'Please can we go back?' she gave in and begged, and he glanced across at her swiftly, surprise in his dark eyes* (Wilson, 1993);

3) request for permission (the implementation of the action is aimed at the speaker): *'May I stay with him a while?' he requested* (Pulsford, 1990).

Communicative situation of appeal. The utterance of appeal expresses the speaker's volition to the addressee and encourages them to perform a particular action or set of actions, which are regarded as essential components of socially significant activity that contributes to the achievement of certain ideas (Kohler, 2017). Thus, the utterance of appeal conveys a specific recommendation to the addressee regarding their behaviour. The speaker's appeal is based on moral, and ethical principles. The addressee makes the decision regarding the implementation of the action. For example: *'Well, let's go out now and look*

for a job' (Orwell, 2001). In the text provided, the speaker uses the utterance of appeal to encourage the addressee to perform the action (find a job), believing that the addressee can, but is obliged to perform it.

By using the utterance of appeal, the speaker expresses a request, an instruction for the addressee to perform a particular action, a demand to start some activity or behave in a certain way. For example: *'Come home with me and let your stepmother stay and rake the ashes'* (Carter, 1996). In the text provided, the speaker is demanding that the addressee behave in a certain way (go home and do not disturb the stepmother). The implementation of the action is beneficial for the addressee.

Communicative situation of necessity. The utterance of necessity expresses an action determined not only by certain circumstances, norms of social life or ethical rules (Дерев'янюк, p. 114), but also the awareness that a particular action is necessary / not necessary, should / should not be performed, the awareness of what should / should not be taken into account under certain circumstances. For example: *'Nonsense, you are little more than a slip of a girl, you would be prey to all sorts of men, fortune hunters and the like. You need someone to look after you.'* (Gower, 1992). In the text provided, the speaker assumes that the addressee cannot perform the action under certain circumstances (you are little more than a slip of a girl). Therefore, the speaker informs the addressee of the necessity to perform another action (to find someone to look after the girl) in order to obtain the best possible outcome.

In our opinion, the utterance of necessity can have the following additional modal connotations:

1) necessity with the connotation of obligation: *'You need it,' Nutty said vehemently. 'Swimming tonight. Running tomorrow. Mr Foggerty said. You got to eat, Hoomey. You're just a weed.'* (Peyton, 1988);

2) necessity with the connotation of desirability: *'Look. It's all so sudden for me. Just give it time. I need some space and time. Just leave it for awhile.'* (Cooper, 1991);

3) necessity with the connotation of possibility: *'You need your sleep, sweetheart, or you'll be no good in the morning.'* (Brayfield, 1990).

Communicative situation of invitation. In our opinion, the utterance of invitation is aimed at the addressee and its communicative-pragmatic intention is to persuade them to perform a particular action. The utterances of invitation involves the implementation of the action that is beneficial for the addressee or for both communicants. For example: *'Want to have a walk round?' he invited* (Ellis, 1993). In the text provided, the speaker (Mick) offers the addressee (Constance) to perform a particular action that is beneficial for both of them. Both the speaker and the addressee

are interested in the implementation of the action (have a walk).

It should be mentioned that the speaker's preference for the ways of expressing the invitation is based on the social status of the addressee, the peculiarities of the situation, and their level of familiarity with the addressee. For example: *'Come in and have some tea, ' a cut-glass voice invited* (Howell, 1991). In the text provided, the speaker's (Mrs Grindlewood-Gryke) volition is aimed at the addressee (Otley) agreeing to a particular action (entering the room). The speaker is interested in the addressee performing the action, which is beneficial for both communicants.

The speaker and the addressee tend to perform the action correctly if there is a sincerity condition (Harman, 1971: 67), and if there is a reference to a time and place for an activity (Wolfson, 1981: 11). We believe that the sincerity / insincerity of the invitation is important for the addressee, i.e. the speaker's genuine desire or need for the addressee to accept the invitation, and the obviousness / non-obviousness of the invitation, i.e. it is important to provide the addressee with information about the time and place of the meeting. For example: *'Come to lunch, ' invited his aunt. 'Dorian Gray will be here and you can meet him again. ' (Nevile, 1989). In the text provided, the indication of the specific time proves the obviousness of the invitation. Specifying the time and place of the meeting emphasizes the sincerity of the speaker's intentions.*

Conclusions. The modal meanings of intentional volition are characterized by the addressee's freedom of choice. The action can be beneficial to the addressee or to both the speaker and the addressee (except for the communicative situations of request and appeal, in which the action is beneficial only to the speaker). In the communicative situation of advice, the status of the speaker is higher; in the communicative situations of suggestion, invitation and necessity, the status of communicants is insignificant; in the communicative situations of request and appeal, both communicants may be equal in status. Either the addressee or third parties are responsible for the action implementation (in the communicative situations of suggestion, invitation and necessity, the action can be performed by the speaker). Modal meanings of intentional volition can be used in both official and unofficial situations, they can be reactive and proactive (except for the communicative situations of appeal and necessity, which are proactive), and they are non-normative (except for the communicative situation of necessity, which is normative).

REFERENCES

1. Дерев'янюк О. А. Семантико-синтаксична структура речень із предикатами дебітивності. *Наукові записки Міжнародного гумані-*

тарного університету. Одеса: «Гельветика». 2017. 27. С. 114–117.

2. Мясоєдова С. В. Категорія спонукання і її вираження в непрямих висловленнях сучасної української мови: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Харків, 2001. 23 с.
3. Телеки М. М., Шинкарук В. Д. Соціальні категорії модусу в текстах епістолярного жанру: монографія. Київ : Вид-во МДГУ ім. П. Могили, 2007. 176 с.
4. Brown P., Lenvinson S. C. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press, 1987. 345 p.
5. Edmonson W. Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis. Michigan: Longman, 1981.
6. Harman E. G. Three Levels of Meaning: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology. London: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
7. Kohler K. J. The Appeal Function. In *Communicative Functions and Linguistic Forms in Speech Interaction. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics.* Cambridge University Press, 2017. P. 164–187. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316756782.006>
8. Rintell E. Getting your Speech Act together: The Pragmatic Ability of Second Language Learners. *Working Papers on Bilingualism.* Toronto: Bilingual Education Projects, 1979. 17. P. 97–106.
9. Searle J. R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
10. Wolfson N. Invitations, compliments and the competence of the native speaker. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics,* 1981. 8(4)[24]. P. 7–22.

SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

1. Aiken J. The kingdom under the sea and other stories. London: Penguin Books, 1989.
2. Brayfield C. The prince. London: Chatto & Windus Ltd, 1990.
3. Carter A. Burning Your Boats. London: Penguin Random House, 1996.
4. Cooper F. Jay loves Lucy. London: Serpent's Tail, 1991.
5. Cooper J. Polo. London: Bantam (Corgi), 1991.
6. Cox J. Don't cry alone. London: Headline Book Pub. plc, 1992.
7. Dahl R. Matilda. Harmondsworth: Puffin, 1989.
8. Ellis A. T. Pillars of gold. London: Penguin Group, 1993.
9. Falk M. Part of the furniture. London: Bellew Pub. Ltd, 1991.
10. Fowles J. A Maggot. Boston: Back Bay Books, 1996.
11. Gervaise M. The distance enchanted. Wendover, Bucks: John Goodchild Pubs, 1983.

12. Gower I. The shoemaker's daughter. London: Corgi Books, 1992.
13. Howell B. Dandelion days. London: Chapman's Pubs Ltd, 1991.
14. McDonald S. The adventures of Endill Swift. Edinburgh: Canongate Pub. Ltd, 1990.
15. Murphy E. A nest of singing birds. London: Headline Book Pub. plc, 1993.
16. Neel J. Death of a partner. London: Constable & Company Ltd, 1991.
17. Nevile J. The picture of Dorian Gray: Oxford Bookworms edition. Oxford: OUP, 1989.
18. Orwell G. Down and Out in Paris and London: Penguin Random House, 2001.
19. Peyton K. M. Who, sir? Me, sir? Oxford: OUP, 1988.
20. Pulsford P. Lee's ghost. London: Constable & Company Ltd, 1990.
21. Scobie P. A twist of fate. Oxford: OUP, 1990.
22. Scott M. Nudists may be encountered. London: Serpent's Tail, 1991.
23. West C., Dickens C. Great Expectations: Oxford Bookworms edition. Oxford: OUP, 1992.
24. Wilson P. Dark sunlight. Richmond, Surrey: Mills & Boon, 1993.