

COMMUNICATIVE ROLE OF IMPERATIVE SENTENCE IN THE DIALOGUE

Irina Suima¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-051-3-8>

Abstract. *The purpose* of the paper is to give a detailed description of the features of the communicative environment of the English imperative sentence in dialogical communication. The subject of the research is the imperative sentence surrounded by the other functional types of sentences that are realized in a certain communicative environment of English dialogical speech. *The research methodology* includes structural – semantic, context – situational, presuppositional and communicative – pragmatic analyzes. Realization of the intention of imperative sentences and the achievement of a perlocutionary effect occurs in the appropriate communicative environment. It regulates, along with linguistic and extralinguistic factors, the type, the degree of realization of the intention of the imperative sentence as a direct speech act. The communicative environment of these utterances in verbal communication is typified and presupposes the inclusion in it of a certain set of functional types of statements in the sequence of their speech implementation. There is a direct correlation between the communicative environment, the position of the imperative sentences in it and the realization of the imperative intention. Imperative statements, entering a certain communicative environment, being surrounded by the other, similar utterances, declarative, interrogative, emotional, are not simply included in their environment, but form an integral piece of text, a coherent sequence of statements, where the place of each one is functionally defined. Therefore, the nature of the leading intention of the communicative context depends not only on its perlocutionary force, but also largely depends on the interaction of all components of the dialogical entity. In most cases, the function of an interrogative statement in the communicative situation of imperativeness is reduced to narrowing or concretizing the topic

¹ Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Ukraine

of conversation, or to strengthening of unambiguous intentions. Although in some cases the question, being a direct speech act, performs the main function in the implementation of the communicative intention of the speaker, it forms the basis of a complex of statements. The function of an emotive communicative unit was considered in communicative linguistics and earlier, but not as a function of the component of an imperative utterance, therefore we note that an emotive part of the dialogue not only emotionally colors the entire communicative move, but also gives the imperative component a great perlocutionary force. *Practical implications* of the results of the paper is in the possibility of their use in optimization of the dialogical communication of students of foreign language faculties, in the lectures on theoretical and communicative grammar and functional stylistics, in the organization of lecture courses and special seminars on the theory of dialogue. *Value/originality*. The English imperative sentence is analyzed from the point of view of its implementation in a communicative environment, the character of functioning in a certain environment is investigated, which helps to realize the intention of the imperativeness.

1. Introduction

The status and place of an imperative sentence in the paradigmatic set of functional types on an intentional basis has long been beyond doubt, because an imperative sentence plays an important role in verbal communication, representing a direct speech act with a clearly expressed intention.

It is well known that several sentence paradigms are offered in linguistics. There are systems that include only three types: declarative, interrogative, imperative sentences [1; 3; 6; 8; 19], there are systems that include four types: declarative, interrogative, imperative and emotional ones [5; 7], so on.

L. Barkhudarov classifies only imperatives in form and meaning as imperative sentences [1, p. 143], A. Smiritsky divides them into interrogatives and imperatives [8, p. 167]. J. Lyons combines interrogative and imperative sentences into one type of *mands* (from commands and demands) [15, p. 200]. The implementation of an imperative sentence in speech is closely interconnected with the concept of a directive speech act, i.e. purposeful speech action performed in accordance with the principles and rules of speech behavior adopted in a given society, affecting the actions and the communicant, and thus causing a certain perlocutionary effect.

In its most general form, a directive speech act is defined as an expression of the speaker's will, aimed at causating the addressee's activity [18, p. 391].

However, one of the most important aspects of imperative sentences, namely the functionally pragmatic, continues to be the least studied.

The expected reaction of the addressee is that he/she performs the caused action, or contributes to its implementation [9, p. 12]. If the addressee follows the principle of cooperation, that is, behaves in accordance with the expectations of the speaker and performs an action, the interaction has a minimum length: imperative – performing an action. If the addressee behaves “non – cooperatively” and refuses to perform the caused action, then the interaction can proceed in two possible directions:

a) the speaker accepts the refusal, and the interaction ends;

b) the speaker does not accept the refusal and insists on performing the desired action.

Dialogical entity is a communication model with the participation of two partners, in which, as in any communication model, there is a speaker, a listener (or addressee) and a statement. On the other hand, dialogical speech act is a reflection of an imperative situation, which includes the following components: a source of imperative, a potential action or state, an executor of a potential action, and an act of imperative.

For an adequate analysis of the directives, it is necessary to take into account both the communicative and the motivating situations and, accordingly, highlight the communicative roles of the speaker and the addressee, and also take into account the communicative roles: the prescriptor and the performer. In addition, the description of the dialogue turns out to be another important role – the role of the person responsible for making a decision – to perform or not to perform the action to which the statement prompts. Indeed, the decision to implement a potential action is made by the participant of the communication who takes a priority position in this speech act. The priority / non – priority attribute is used to characterize the speaker and the addressee in the work of A. Doroshenko and is defined as “a position in the social – role structure of a communicative act, depending on the presence / absence of powers to dispose of the actions of another person” [4, p. 18].

Taking the concept of priority / non – priority as very essential for differentiating dialogical speech acts, E. Belyaeva states the following formulation: priority / non – priority is a position in the hierarchy of

relations between communicants in a speech act, which is determined by the presence / absence of powers to control the performance of the action to which the statement prompts [2, p. 36].

As additional parameters for the definition of dialogical speech act are considered imperative and pragmatic presuppositions concerning the sphere of the speaker and the sphere of the addressee and their relationship to potential action. These factors are essential not only for constructing a typology of dialogical speech acts, but for determining the rules for choosing the form of expression of them.

Speaking about dialogical speech act, as well as the speaker – addressee relationship, it is necessary to note the role of the dialogical structure of speech. In dialogue, as a form of communication, interconnections between its participants are manifested, i.e. direct subjects of interaction, on the one hand, and those speech units that they produce to achieve a certain goal, on the other.

In modern linguistics, dialogical speech is interpreted as a special type of speech activity, characterized by situational awareness, the presence of two or more communicants, quick response, and personal orientation [11; 12; 13].

In accordance with the sign of directionality in linguistics, initiating (stimulating, controlling, intentional) utterances are distinguished, in which the speaker's thought is expressed, and reactive (responsive) ones. Between the utterances of the dialogue, a "stimulus – response" relationship is established, i.e. each original replica directly and directly generates the next, responsive replica.

The subject of research in the paper is imperative sentences surrounded by similar or the other functional statements, realized in a certain communicative environment of dialogical speech.

The purpose of the study is to give a detailed description of the features of the communicative environment of the English imperative sentences in dialogical speech communication.

The purpose determined the formulation of the following research tasks:

- to define the notion of imperative intention, to identify the patterns of the appearance of its constituent components;
- to consider a typology of imperative statements;
- to give a structural, semantic and pragmatic description of the main types of imperativeness in the modern English language.

The research methodology includes structural – semantic, context – situational, presuppositional and communicative – pragmatic analyzes.

The material for the linguistic analysis was the dialogical speech of written representation, mainly from the works of modern English – language prose, from the 30s of the 20th century to the present.

Each functional type of utterance has its own intention. Imperative, as an intention, takes place in a certain communicative situation, and it implements the principle of influence in verbal communication. The main intention of the speaker is to induce the interlocutor to action or speech action. The category “imperative” includes not only an order, but also a number of other intentions, such as: demand, request, command, offer, invitation, consolation, advice, suggestion, which are the subintentions of “imperative” [5, p. 57].

The analysis of the realization of the intention of the imperative and its location is also possible due to the peculiarities of role relations, the socio – psychological distance between the interactants and the general atmosphere of communication.

2. Imperative as a communicative intention

In modern linguistics, there are two interrelated concepts of communicative task and communicative intention. The first concept expresses the speaker’s opinion, not showed in linguistic form, an intention that reflects the process of his/her mental activity. This means that before conducting a conversation, the speaker mentally, sometimes at the subconscious level, prepares his/her thought, selects the necessary means for its expression, chooses the tactics and communication strategy for the successful implementation of the set communicative task.

On the other hand, the communicative intention is inherent only in the utterance, it is the embodiment of the speaker’s thoughts, realized through a certain type or set of functionally related types of utterances. It is also true that for the speaker to fully realize his/her intention, one statement is not enough, and he/she resorts to a complex expression of intention with the help of several functional types of statements. This is done with the aim of a clearer expression of thought, or, on the contrary, there is some duality, uncertainty in understanding the real intention, the speaker is trying to veil the true intention of what he is talking about.

When considering the varieties of communicative situations, this paper analyzes the dominant impulse surrounded by other functional types of statements, it can be a declarative statement, interrogative, emotive, or other imperative statement. We will try to identify patterns in the implementation of the speaker's communicative intention in a certain type of communicative environment. In this classification, it is not so much the position of the imperative (pre-, post-, inter-) that is important, but its environment with a certain functional type of utterance, which serves as a presentation of the speaker's communicative task into the communicative intention of the utterance. This ultimately leads to successful communication in general, and the expression of the speaker's intention, in particular.

As noted above, in the process of dialogue, not only linguistic factors are important, but also extralinguistic ones, such as:

- 1) role relationships;
- 2) the ratio of socio-psychological distance;
- 3) communication environment.

Therefore, a pragmatic analysis of the communicative environment of imperative includes both a detailed analysis of the context of the use of a certain imperative, a situation, and an analysis of the components that directly surround the dominant of a complex of statements.

Four complexes were subjected to the analysis of the communicative environment of the initiating imperative utterance, each of which differs in a set of functional types of sentences, and through their combination the speaker's initial communicative intention is realized.

The first complex consists of the use of a certain imperative utterance in a communicative environment, consisting of one or more declarative and vocative utterances. We have identified the following subtypes with the participation of declaratives that make up the communicative environment of imperative statements:

- 1) imperative + declarative;
- 2) imperative + vocative + declarative;
- 3) declarative + declarative + imperative;
- 4) declarative + imperative + declarative.

Let us turn to the analysis of the indicated types of communicative situation, in which an imperative statement is combined with a declarative that helps to realize the communicative intention of the speaker.

Imperative + declarative

In this subtype of the communicative environment, the imperative is a dominant statement and it is in the preposition, and the declarative is in the right context.

Let us turn to the following communicative context.

The action takes place at night near a private mansion. The presidential bodyguard tells the chief of staff that the presidential limousine must leave immediately or it will be noticed. A murder was committed about an hour ago, and the president became a direct participant. The chief of staff and the bodyguard are connected by the non-standard situation, the subordinate relations are somewhat violated, since both the first and the second are connected by a common secret that must be hidden.

Burton touched his radio earpiece, listening intently for a moment. He turned to Russell.

"We better set the hell out of here. Varney just scoped a patrol car coming down the road"

"The alarm ...?" Russell looked puzzled. Burton shook his head. "It's probably just a rent – a – cop on routine, but if he sees something..." He didn't need to say anything else [10, p. 44].

Burton advises *We Better to get the hell out of here* and warns that guards have spotted a police car. Interestingly, polite advice, which is very appropriate for this situation of a subordinate's address to the boss, is combined with the harsh vocabulary *of get the hell out of here*. This fact is not strange because the communication environment is viewed by the speaker as informal or even as a situation of particular tension.

The communicative environment consists of imperative in a preposition, which is a semantically dominant, and a declarative in a legal context, the role of which is not only in providing additional information, but also simultaneously in exerting pressure on the listener. The speaker, despite his lower position in the career ladder, considers he has the right to take over the leadership of further actions because of his greater competence and professional experience.

The addressee's reaction is bewilderment, expressed by the elliptical question *"The alarm...?"*, The addressee did not expect such a turn of events, in his opinion, nothing at that moment should prevent them from escaping from the scene. The speaker's next remark dispels doubts:

“It’s probably just a rent – a – cop on routine, but if he sees something...”. The effectiveness of the imperative and, accordingly, the full implementation of the plan and the implementation of the speaker’s plans into reality are obvious: *“Didn’t need to say anything else”*.

Let’s look at another example. Love date. He is a secret agent, a bodyguard, she is the chief of staff of the president, they are connected not only by an incipient love relationship, but also by an official one. Gloria Russell needs not so much a love affair with a young man, but rather support and help from him, she uses him to carry out her selfish plans. Colleen does not know about this and comes on the first date to her house:

Gloria Russell was sitting at one of the garden tables when Agent Collin pulled up in his convertible, back ramrod straight, suit still crisp, tie knotted rigidly. The Chief of Staff had not changed either. She smiled at him and they walked up the front walk together and into the house.

“Drink? You look like a bourbon – and water person”. Russell looked at the young man and slowly drained her third glass of white wine. *It had been a long time since she had a young man over. Maybe too long, she was thinking, although the alcohol guaranteed that she was not thinking that clearly.*

“Beer, if you have it” [10, p. 152].

Gloria offers a drink to the guest and her next phrase *“You look like a bourbon – and water person”* explains this invitation in some way. In her opinion, Colleen looks like he needs to take whiskey. This phrase traces the speaker’s insistence to causate the addressee’s action, expressed by an elliptical question with an imperative intention.

The communicative environment, as in the previous case, consists of an urge in a preposition, which is an intentional dominant, and a declarative in a legal context, the role of which is in expressing persistence on the part of the speaker, as well as the benefit, in his opinion, of committing actions. The speaker considers himself entitled to direct the actions of the addressee for two reasons: a higher official position, and also the fact that she is the mistress of the house.

Reaction – order *“Beer, if you have it”*. The addressee accepts the speaker’s offer, but does not do so categorically, but with some opportunity to leave, in case the speaker does not have a beer *“if you have it”*. The communicative plan of the speaker has been realized, and the success of the completion of the communicative task is evident.

The next communicative situation takes place in the same house and with the same characters. Colleen went to see Russell on a date. A very sensitive issue is being discussed: what should they do in this situation – the president is involved in the murder, they are witnesses and accomplices in the crime, it is necessary to act, but how?

She touched his arm, left it there.

“I didn’t mean it that way. I know he’s good. I just know about him sometimes. It’s hard to explain. It’s just an instinct on my part”.

“You should trust your instincts. I do”. He looked at her. She looked younger, much younger, like she should be graduating college, ready to take on the world.

“My instincts tell me that you ‘re someone I can depend on, Tim”.

“I am”. He drained his drink.

“Always?”

He stared at her, touched his empty glass to hers. “Always” [10, p.158].

As can be seen, the communicative environment consists of imperative in a preposition and a declarative in a legal context. The declarative is a confirmation of the speaker’s thoughts, expressed in the dominant imperative utterance. The speaker feels his influence on the addressee and believes that the advice is inactive for the latter, although quite recently such advice would not have been possible due to the subordinate relations between the interlocutors.

The woman takes the position of speaker. She needs him in order to catch the only witness to their crime, she feels that she can rely on this person: *“My instincts tell me that you’re someone I can depend on, Tim”*. The intention of this expression is not just a message of information, but an urge addressed to the speaker) to be support and protection. The addressee manifests himself as the main one in this situation and the illusion of the speaker’s leadership dissipates, the addressee takes the initiative into his own hands: *“Always?”*, to which the first responds, *“Always”*.

For all the complexity of the relationship between the interlocutors, the speaker’s plan was realized, but the addressee’s plan was also realized. This gives the basis for thinking about the success of the completion of communication as a whole.

Summing up the results of the first subgroup “imperative + declarative”, we can talk about the following features of the implementation of imperative

in this communicative situation, which is a semantically dominant of politeness often marked by formulas, as well as the implementation of the speaker's communicative intention:

– the functions of the declarative in the legal context are:
1) communication of additional information, more complete disclosure of the speaker's communicative intention; 2) putting pressure on the listener and expressing persistence on the part of the speaker; 3) the speaker's attempt to get away from the topic of conversation, if this topic is unpleasant for him/her;

– the reaction of the addressee – the execution of the caused action by the addressee, the full realization of the intention and the transformation of the speaker's plans into reality. The addressee performs the action, feeling the influence of the speaker, according to the opinion: which causation is beneficial. Sometimes the intention of the speaker and the intention of the addressee can come true. This fact characterizes communication as more successful.

Imperative + vocative + declarative

In this subtype of the communicative environment, the imperative is the dominant statement and it is in the preposition, and the declarative is in the right context, complicated by the vocative component. The imperative can also be in the postposition, and the declarative and vocative in the left context.

Let us turn to the following communication contexts:

A young couple, a few months before the wedding, are going to a reception at the White House. Jack just came home from work, he is a lawyer, Jennifer went to his apartment to check how he was going to this prestigious and important party for her family. The relationship is symmetrical, the partners talk on equal terms, but the experience of the girl, who has been to such meetings many times, puts her in a priority position. Jack wants to put on his blue double – sided suit, as, in his opinion, a tailcoat is not necessary, but his girlfriend is against:

Jack undressed and jumped in the shower. He pulled the curtain aside. "Jenn, can you get out my blue double – breasted?"

She walked into the bathroom, looked around in ill – concealed disgust. "The invitation said black tie".

“Black tie optional,” he corrected her, rubbing the soap out of his eyes.

“Jack, don’t do this. It’s the White House for god sakes, it’s the president”.

“They give you the option, black tie or not. I’m exercising my right to forgo the black tie. Besides, I don’t have a tux”. He grinned at her and pulled the curtain closed.

Jennifer appeared smiling: “Compliments of Baldwin Enterprises. It’s an Ar – mani. It ‘ll look wonderful on you” [10, p. 61].

The girl demands that Jack not wear his suit *“Jack, don’t do this”*. But put on a tailcoat, then she explains very emotionally why this is so, and not otherwise, (double nomination of the design with an introductory *it*, as well as an emotional component for god sakes): *“It’s the White House for god sakes, it’s the president”*. The main intention of the speaker is to prohibit the addressee from performing the desired action.

The communicative environment of imperative in this case is complicated by a vocative component, the purpose of which is to enhance the action of the dominant imperative. The speaker refers specifically to the addressee and prohibits him from violating generally accepted rules. An emotional statement in a right context emphasizes the speaker’s persistence, her experience in enterprises of this kind.

Jack’s reaction is not an uncomplaining acceptance of what he is told, of resists and expresses his point of view. In his opinion, if the invitation says that a tailcoat is not required, then you need to take advantage of the offer and check if this is so. In addition, he has a good reason – the absence of a tailcoat in his wardrobe: *“Besides, I don’t have a tux”*. The addressee does not accept the speaker’s priority position, even despite the experience of the latter, due to his own opinion.

Let us turn to the following communicative situation. A young girl, Tracy Whitney, ends up in a prison cell, she is accused of attempted murder of a very famous person. Finally, she gets the opportunity to call her friend Charles, who, in her opinion, is able to free her. She calls, but it is not Charles himself who picks up the phone, but his assistant:

It was not until the following afternoon that the desk sergeant would permit Tracy to use the telephone. Harriet answered. “Mr. Stanhope’s office”.

“Harriet, this is Tracy Whitney. I’d like to speak to Mr. Stanhope”.

“Just a moment, Miss Whitney”. She heard the hesitation in the secretary’s voice. “I’ll – I’ll see if Mr. Stanhope is in”.

After a long, harrowing wait, Tracy finally heard Charles's voice [17, p. 45].

Tracy prefaces her request "*Can I speak to Mr. Stanhope*" by introducing the vocative component "*Harriet*" and the declarative "*This is Tracy Whitney*". Vocative and declarative respect the principle of politeness, they precede the impulse, reinforcing its perlocution. The imperative itself is expressed indirectly, but based on the communicative context, we understand that the intention of the imperative utterance is an urgent request.

The communicative environment of imperative consists of vocative and declarative, with the help of which the speaker initiates a request in conventional ways. All utterances convey the utmost degree of politeness of the speaker in relation to the addressee.

The response of the assistant is seen as the perception of the addressee's request, he politely replies "*One moment, Miss Whitney*". Despite the hesitation in his voice, he is unable to refuse due to the insistence of the addressee.

Thus, the speaker achieves the execution of the caused action by the addressee, observing the principle of politeness, he fully implements his communicative plan.

The following events take place at a social reception where the main character Jack is introduced to the president. Everyone talks about his abilities and predicts a partnership in one of the large companies, saying that it is only a matter of time. The president has a good relationship with the family of Jack's bride. He is holding the president's arm, which is damaged by playing tennis: "*Jack Graham, Mr. President. It's an honor to meet you, sir*". "*I feel like I already know you, Jack, Jennifer's told me so much about you Most of it good*". He grinned.

"Jack's a partner at Patton, Shaw & Lord". Jennifer still held on to the President's arm. She looked at Jack and smiled a cutesy smile. "Well, not the partner yet, Jenn".

"Matter of time is all" Ransom Baldwin's voice boomed out.

"With Baldwin enterprises as a client, you could name your price at any firm in this country. Don't you forget that? Don't let Sandy Lord pull the wool over your eyes".

"Listen to him, Jack. The voice of experience" The President raised his glass and then involuntarily jerked it back Jennifer stumbled, letting go of his arm [10, p. 69].

The President addresses by name, and thereby softens the general level of imperative, transferring it from an order to persistent advice. The imperative itself initiates the communicative course and encloses the main intention of the speaker. The declaration plays a double role: firstly, it expresses the speaker's respect for one of the participants in the dialogue; secondly, it explains why listening to him is beneficial for the addressee.

The communicative environment of imperative consists of a vocative that softens the illocution of the entire move and a declarative in a legal context that reveals the main intention of the speaker.

The main intention of the speaker is not so much to influence the addressee as to express respect for the people who stand above him in business and on whom the well – being of the authorities really depends. Jack is a kind of conductor through which the speaker expresses his attitude towards another interlocutor.

Summing up the results of the second subgroup “imperative + vocative + declarative”, it can be told about the following features of the implementation of the imperative of this communicative situation, which is the semantically dominant and the implementation of communicators; the speaker's intention, the addressee's reaction:

- vocative component – strengthening the influence of the dominant urge, as well as softening the illocution of the entire move;
- the declarative contains information necessary to perform the causal action, the speaker observes the principle of politeness when revealing his main intention, compliance with this principle leads to the implementation of the speaker's communicative intention.
- the reaction of the addressee, as in most cases, depends on the position of the co-talkers, but the addressee may not perceive the priority position of the speaker, relying on his own knowledge. When a low-position communicator addresses a higher-ranking one, the response to arousal is not necessary.

Declarative + declarative + imperative

In this subtype of the communicative environment, the imperative is the dominant statement and it is in the postposition, and the declarative is in the left context.

Let us turn to the following communication contexts:

A young couple in a restaurant, they recently met. They had their first date in the morning, now they have dinner. Florence Gardner is an actress who came to star in the film, Michael Stors is a businessman who came to have a rest from business. They discuss plans for the next day:

They ate in a small French restaurant, by candlelight ... His body felt light any floating, making every moment particular and lasting.

"And tomorrow?" She said.

"Tomorrow we shall continue as before". ...

... "I should work ..". she began.

"I know. And you 're not going to".

She greened again. "I guess that's what I was going to say". Then she saw man and a woman being seated across the room and waived and said to Michae "Oh, there's an old friend of mine form New York. I had no idea she was out here. Do you mind if I so over and say hello ? "

"Will I have to be introduced?"

"No".

"Then go".

She patted his hand and stood up and crossed the room, her blonde hair in the flickering light of the candles on the tables. What a dear, bright, straightforward woman, he thought [16, p. 65].

In the course of the conversation, the girl unexpectedly saw her friend. She politely asks Michael if he doesn't mind if she comes over and says hello "*Do you mind if I go over and say hello?*" Before that, she explained her desire to approach her friend – she did not expect to meet her here. The speaker's intention is to obtain permission from her interlocuter to perform a certain action.

As you can see, the communicative environment of an imperative statement differs from the above examples, since declaratives constitute the left context of an imperative, and it itself is in postposition. The role of declaratives is to prepare the dominant intention, the urge to give permission to perform the desired action. Although the interlocutors are in equal symmetrical relations, in this case, obtaining permission is a matter of politeness and respect, and one cannot talk about the predominance of one interlocutor over the other. The speaker cues the addressee's future action based on the general atmosphere of their communication and interpersonal relationships.

The response to this urge is not unusual. Michael assumes the position of his girlfriend and gives his *“permission”*: *“Then go”, but re; by this he clarifies whether he will have to introduce himself*. The speaker’s installation was successfully implemented, the addressee accepted the prompting and gave the expected response.

Let’s turn to the following communicative context. Here is an example of a subordinate relationship. The supervisor instructs his subordinate to sort out and give his thoughts on financial documents by the afternoon of the next day.

Alvis sat down, placed the fourteen inch file he was carrying on Jack’s desk and leaned back.

“Deals die, then they come back to haunt you. We need your comments on the secondary financing documents by tomorrow afternoon”.

Jack almost dropped his pen. “That’s fourteen agreements and over five hundred pages, Barry. When did you find out about this?”

Alvis stood up and Jack caught the beginning of a smile tugging at the other man’s face.

“Fifteen agreements, and the official page count is six hundred and thirteen pages, single spaced, not counting exhibits. Thanks, Jack. Patton, Shaw really appreciate it”. He turned back. “Oh, have a great time with the president tonight, and say hello to Ms. Baldwin”.

Alvis walked out [10, p. 65].

Elvis brings a stack of documents with the words: *“Deals die, then they come back to haunt you”*. Such a phrase is visual for the perception of the nature of financial documents. The result is obvious, at the moment we need a specialist to carry out the inspection: *“We need your comments on the secondary financing documents by tomorrow afternoon”*.

Communicative environment: declarative in the left context, the task of which is to prepare the main idea of the speaker, expressed in imperative: – order. The speaker has the right to order the addressee, understanding his leading position.

Jack does not resignedly accept the task, he believes that he needs more time: *“That’s fourteen agreements and over five hundred pages, Barry”*, he jokingly remarks when and where Barry got them from: *“When did you find out about this?”* But business is business, Barry is relentless in his desire to completely occupy Jack for the next day.

The next episode takes place a day after Elvis instructed Jack to sort out the documents. The characters are the same, but the general atmosphere

is more friendly. Elvis had never expected Jack to get it right in a short time. The subordinate justified the trust of the boss. A conversation is held between equal partners with a close socio – psychological distance.

Twenty minutes, but first Jack had to check with Alvis on the Bishop documents ... Alvis had scanned them, the astonishment clear on his features.

“This looks pretty good. I realize I gave you a tough deadline. I don’t usually like to do that”. His eyes were averted. “I really appreciate this hustle, Jack. I’m sorry, if I screwed up your plans”.

“No sweat, Barry, that’s what they pay me for”. Jack had turned to leave Barry had risen from his desk.

“Jack, uh, we really haven’t had a chance to talk since you’ve been here Place is so damn big. Let’s have lunch one day, soon”.

“Sounds great, Barry, have your secretary give mine some dates”. At that moment, Jack realized that Barry Alvis wasn’t such a bad guy [10, p. 111].

Elvis is pleased with Jack’s quickness, but he regrets that earlier it was not possible to get to know each other better. He adds, as if apologizing for such a mistake on his part: *“Place is so damn big”*, using the informal vocabulary *“Damn”* and the emotional exclamation *“uh”* reduces the formality of the situation. This is followed by the prompt *“Let’s have lunch one day, soon”*. The speaker’s intention is not just an invitation to lunch, but a friendship with the addressee.

The communicative environment of imperative in the post position consists of two declaratives, the first is complicated by the vocal component, the role of which is to reduce the degree of formality between the boss and the subordinate, it is a kind of bridge to friendly relations. Thus, the speaker’s intention to establish friendly relations with the addressee is implemented, the communicative task is successfully solved.

Summing up the results of the third subgroup declarative + declarative + imperative, it can be told about the following features of the implementation of imperative in this communicative situation, which is a semantically dominant and features of the reaction in the implementation of the speaker’s communicative intention:

- declaratives contain the preparation of the main idea of the speaker;
- the response to such an impulse is the verbal or non – verbal execution of the caused action, since the speaker follows the principle of politeness, which uses declaratives and vocatives to explain the next imperative.

Declarative + imperative + declarative

Half an hour later Brown and Jones were still playing trains on the dining – room table. But their wives upstairs in the drawing room hardly noticed their absence.

“Oh, I think it’s the loveliest doll I’ve ever seen. I must get one like it for Ulvina. Won’t Clarisse be perfectly enchanted?” Said Mrs. Brown.

“Yes,” answered Mrs. Jones, “and she’ll have all the fun of arranging the dresses. Children love that so much. Look! There are three little dresses with the doll, aren’t they cute? All cut ready to stitch together”.

“Oh, how perfectly lovely,” exclaimed Mrs. Brown [14, p. 6].

To Mrs Brown’s remark that she needs to buy the same doll for her daughter, Mrs. Jones replies: *“Yes, and she’ll have all the fun of arranging the dresses”*. Then she continues to develop her thought: *“Children love that so much”*. She does not even hide her surprise and admiration, she wants to share this with her friend, encourages her to look: *“Look!”* there is something else in the box. It should be noted that “appeal” is an emotional version of the request subintention. She completely forgot that this is a gift not for her, but for her daughter and is already thinking about what needs to be done with the dresses: *“All cut ready to stitch together”*.

The communicative environment of imperative in the interposition consists of a declarative in the left context, which is the answer to the previous remark, a dividing question with the intention of the message, additional confirmation! information, as well as a declarative statement that complements the imperative and the dividing issue. The speaker asks the addressee to share feelings with her. She vividly describes the contents of the box.

The reaction is a complete understanding on the part of Mrs. Brown, she clicks: *“Oh, how perfectly lovely”*. *The speaker reached her goal, she achieved her imperative, surrounded by exclamations that her friends “went over to her side”*.

Let us consider the following communicative context. At a social reception. Young couple Jack and Jennifer talk about the need for the man to leave immediately. The girl does not like a lot of work that no one can do except him. Jennifer wanted to spend the whole evening with Jack. She gives all sorts of reasons why Jack should stay, but he is not pleading – business. He is confident that his departure will not be noticed. Relationships between communicants are equal, a tense communication environment.

That was an afterthought. Jack had met the President, had shaken hands with him. He hoped his hand got better. He pulled Jennifer aside and made his regrets. She was not pleased.

“This is totally unacceptable, Jack. Do you realize how special a night this is for Daddy?”

“Hey, I’m just working stiff. You know? Billable hours?” ...

...“Jenn, it’s my job. I said don’t worry about it, so don’t worry about it. I’ll see you tomorrow. I’m gonna grab a cab back”.

“Daddy will be disappointed”.

“Daddy won’t even miss me. Hey, hoist one for me. And remember what you said about later? I’ll take a rain check on that, maybe we can make it my place for a change?”.

She allowed herself to be kissed. But when Jack was gone she stormed over to her father [10, p. 70].

To Jennifer’s reproach that he is acting dishonestly, and she does not like it at all, Jack literally boiled over, he uses the abrupt phrase: *“Jenn it’s my job”*. further insistently demands not to think about what should not concern her, he uses the same phrase twice, this emphasizes his resolve: *“I said don’t worry about it, so don’t worry about it”* to soften perseverance, he clarifies plans for the next day: *“I’ll see you tomorrow”*, again returns to the initial conversation about leaving the reception. The speaker forbids the addressee to speak about these matters.

The communicative environment of imperative in interposition consists of a declarative in the left context, which precedes the dominant imperative. The right context is made up of two declarative statements, as noted earlier, the first softens the persistence, and the second returns the addressee to the main topic of the conversation. The speaker is busy with business and, in his opinion, no one should interfere with him. Despite the close relationship, the speaker has the right to dictate his requirements due to the incompetence of the addressee.

Summing up the results of the fourth subgroup “declarative + imperative + declarative” it can be told about the following features of the implementation of imperative in this communicative situation:

– a declarative in the left context can be a response to a previous remark, linking it with the urge itself, and it can also precede the dominant imperative, preparing the addressee for a conversation;

- the declarative in the right context complements the imperative with information and returns the addressee to the main topic of the conversation;
- reaction – often reflects a complete understanding of the parties, as in the previous subtype of the intention, this is achieved as a result of a detailed explanation of the imperative.

3. Conclusions

Imperative is a semantically dominant, often marked by formulas of politeness: vocatives, the word please or its functional synonyms, as well as conventional constructions expressing a polite attitude such as “we’d better”. More demanding and effective are the imperatives that stand in the post – position, completing the move, this happens due to the fact that the speaker has previously stated the formation of the action, and in conclusion, nominated it. As a rule, the addressee perceives the causation adequately to the situation.

Fewer perlocutions carry impulses in pre – and interpositions. The speaker first nominates the caused action, and then proceeds to explain the expediency of its execution, gives information content.

The implementation of a certain subintention “imperative” depends on the parameters of the situation, as well as on the filling of the communicative situation with an imperative statement, a certain combination of its components. It can be concluded that in the communicative situation imperative + declarative with equal relations of communicants are typical of the implementation of the intentions of suggestions, namely “advice” and “suggestions”. With communicative situation imperative + vocative + declarative (a variant of the first group, complicated by a vocative component) with unequal relations between communicants, the subintention “demand”, “persistent request”, as well as “persistent advice” are realized.

In the communicative situation declarative + declarative + imperative, imperative realizes the intention of “invitation” and “request” in case of equal relations and a close joint venture distance, and it can also be a “prescription” for communicants.

In the communicative situation declarative + imperative + declarative, imperative realizes the subintention of “emotional request” and “insistent demand” in a situation characterized as tense or extraordinary when communicating with equal communicants.

Imperative statements, entering a certain communicative environment, being surrounded by the other, similar utterances, declarative, interrogative, emotional, are not simply included in their environment, but form an integral piece of text, a coherent sequence of statements, where the place of each one is functionally defined. Therefore, the nature of the leading intention of the communicative context depends not only on its perlocutionary force, but also largely depends on the interaction of all components of the dialogical entity.

In most cases, the function of an interrogative statement in the communicative situation of imperativeness is reduced to narrowing or concretizing the topic of conversation, or to strengthening of unambiguous intentions. Although in some cases the question, being a direct speech act, performs the main function in the implementation of the communicative intention of the speaker, it forms the basis of a complex of statements. The function of an emotive communicative unit was considered in communicative linguistics and earlier, but not as a function of the component of an imperative utterance, therefore we note that an emotive part of the dialogue not only emotionally colors the entire communicative move, but also gives the imperative component a great perlocutionary force.

References:

1. Barkhudarov L. S. (1966). *Struktura prostogo predlozheniya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka* [The structure of the simple sentence of the modern English language]. Moscow: 200. (in Russian)
2. Belyaeva E. I. (1992). *Grammatika i pragmatika pobuzhdeniya: angliyskiy yazyk* [Grammar and pragmatics of the imperative: the English language]. Voronezh: 167. (in Russian)
3. Blokh M. Ya. (1983). *Teoreticheskaya grammatika angliyskogo yazyka* [Theoretical grammar of the English language]. Moscow: 383. (in Russian)
4. Doroshenko A. B. (1985). *Pobuditel'nye rechevye akty i ikh interpretatsiya v tekste (na materiale angliyskogo yazyka)* [Imperative speech acts and their interpretation in the text (on the material of the English language)]. (PhD Thesis). Moscow: 26. (in Russian)
5. Mikhaylov L. M. (1994). *Kommunikativnaya grammatika nemetskogo yazyka* [Communicative grammar of the English language]. Moscow: 256. (in Russian)
6. Molchanova G. P. (1977). *Leksiko-grammaticheskaya kharakteristika imperativnykh predlozheniy v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke* [Lexical-grammatical characteristics of the imperative sentence in the modern English language]. (PhD Thesis). Moscow: 25. (in Russian)
7. Pocheptsov O. G. (1986). *Osnovy pragmaticheskogo opisaniya predlozheniya* [Fundamentals of the pragmatic description of the sentence]. Kiev: 297. (in Russian)

8. Smirnitkiy A. I. (1957). *Sintaksis angliyskogo yazyka* [Syntax of the English language]. Moscow: 287. (in Russian)
9. Khrakovskiy B. C., Volodin A. P. (1986). *Semantika i tipologiya imperativa. Russkiy imperative* [Semantics and typology of the imperative. The Russian imperative]. Leningrad: 272. (in Russian)
10. Baldacci D. (1997). Absolute Power. *Pocket Books*: 469. (in Russian)
11. Fries Ch.C. (1959). The structure of English. London: 215.
12. Haselow A., (2018). Language change from a psycholinguistic perspective: The long – term effects of frequency on language processing. *Language Sciences*. V. 70. Amsterdam: 56–77.
13. Haselow A., Hancil S. (2018). Rethinking language change from a dialogic perspective. *Language Sciences*. V. 68. Amsterdam: 1–5.
14. Leacock S. (1968). The Errors of Santa Claus. Moscow: 5–8.
15. Lyons J. (1991). Natural language and universal grammar. Cambridge: 290.
16. Shaw I. (1982). The Top of the Hill. New English Library: 320.
17. Sheldon S. (1986). If Tomorrow Comes. Pan Books Ltd.: 385.
18. Skinner B.J. (1975). Verbal Behaviour. New York: 480.
19. Strang B. M. H. (1962). Modern English Structure. London: 201.