SECTION 6. GENERAL LINGUISTICS

THE CATEGORY OF THE ADDRESSER REALIZATION IN ENGLISH LITERARY TEXT: FORMAL, SEMANTIC AND COMMUNICATIVE LEVELS

РЕАЛІЗАЦІЯ КАТЕГОРІЇ АДРЕСАНТНОСТІ В АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ЛІТЕРАТУРНОМУ ТЕКСТІ: ФОРМАЛЬНИЙ, СЕМАНТИЧНИЙ, КОМУНІКАТИВНИЙ РІВНІ

Andrushchenko V. O.
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at the English Philology and Translation Department Horlivka Institute for Foreign Languages of the State Higher Educational Establishment "Donbas State Pedagogical University" Dnipro, Ukraine

Андрущенко В. О.
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри англійської філології та перекладу Горлівський інститут іноземних мов ДВНЗ "Донбаський державний педагогічний університет" м. Дніпро, Україна

A literary text has always been analysed from the perspective of a structural, semantic, socio-communicative and pragmatic approaches. However, the study of a text as a conversation between an addresser and an addressee (J. Austin, A. Giddens, M. Halliday, T. Yeshchenko, A. Zahnitko) with focus on the category of the addresser, its linguistic expression and interrelation with the other text categories within a text whole needs further discussion and clarification.

A text as a communicative occurrence meets seven standards of textuality. The standards of textuality which are set forth in are all relational in character, concerned with how occurrences are connected to others: via grammatical dependencies on the surface (cohesion); via conceptual dependencies in the textual world (coherence); via the attitudes of the participants toward the text (intentionality and acceptability); via the incorporation of the new and unexpected into the known and expected (informativity); via the setting (situationality); and via the mutual relevance of separate texts (intertextuality) [3, p. 3]. If any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative.

In the current study we regard the category of the addresser as a linguistic-social (A. Zahnitko) [1], communicative category, which being

expressed by language tools of the coherence category, stimulates a recipient's perception and awareness of the global macrosense (integrity) of a literary informatively complete text continuum whilst analyzing its microsenses within supra-phrasal unities (segmentation).

Along with the categories of segmentation, integrity, and continuum in the light of the communicative aspect of text structure organization, we will respectively distinguish the categories of the addresser, the addressee, intentionality, informativity, and intertextuality.

To our mind, it is the category of the addresser, which being interrelated with the category of intentionality, reveals the intention of the addresser to convey an informative (theme-rheme) (informativity, intertextuality) text message to the addressee, since the category of the addressee expresses the acceptability by the latter of an informative (theme–rheme) (informativity, intertextuality) text message presented by the addresser [2, p. 55–56].

As follows, communicative categories must be regarded respectively to text levels: 1) formal level – coherence (cohesion); 2) semantic level – coherence (coherence); 3) communicative level – the categories of the addresser, the addressee, intentionality, informativity, intertextuality, continuum, segmentation; 4) paradigmatic level – integrity.

The current research considers *the category of the addresser* in interrelation with the category of *intentionality* (the addresser's intention) as a *communicative* category which is correspondingly formalized on *communicative* level by *formal*, *semantic* and *communicative* means of *the coherence category* manifestation within a supra-phrasal unity as a micro-structure of a text whole.

At this, the *object* of the research is a literary text communicative organization (in the fantasy novels *Harry Potter* by J. Rowling).

The *subject* of the study is *the category of the addresser* and its formalization by the coherence category cohesive devices on formal, semantic and communicative levels within the analysed text continuum.

In the course of our study, we have traced and identified that the category of the addresser is linguistically expressed by the coherence category *formal*, *semantic* and *communicative* level markers realization.

To show this, we will analyse some examples from Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone by J. Rowling. It is the extract when Harry Potter is talking to Professor Quirrell about the Philosopher's Stone and has no clues at all that just in a minute he is going to meet the Dark Lord face to face who is hiding in Professor Quirrell's turban.

1) <u>Formal level markers</u>: grammatical cohesion (anaphora, deictics (the article "the"), submodifiers, pronouns, substitution (verbal, nominal), ellipsis etc.); lexical cohesion (repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, collocation) [4]:

'But Snape always seemed <u>to hate</u> me so much'.

'Oh, he <u>does</u>,' said Quirrell casually, 'heavens, yes. He was at Hogwarts with your father, didn't you know? They <u>loathed</u> each other. But he never wanted you dead [5, p. 312].

The components within this SPU are structured by such formal cohesive markers as: 1) lexical synonymic repetition of the verbs: *to hate – loathed*; 2) incomplete elliptical sentence *Oh, he does* in which the auxiliary verb *does* substitutes the infinitive of the notional verb *to hate* of the prepositive sentence (by this, the addresser, on the one hand, tends to avoid the recurrence of the same lexeme, though, on the other hand, deliberately makes the sentence uttered by Professor Quirrell emphatic and, therefore, more expressive). The analysis of these formal tools within SPU enables the addressee to reveal the covert communicative sense which appears to be not that easy for Harry to admit – Snape who seemed to be longing for Harry's death all the time, in fact, is making great efforts to save and defend him.

2) <u>Semantic level markers</u>: referential cohesion (anaphoric, cataphoric, exophoric, homophoric, comparative, bridging reference), conjunctive cohesion (subordination, coordination conjunctions), thematic cohesion (thematic progression), thematic / rhematic relations in clauses; semantic relations of explanation, cause, consequence etc. [4]:

<u>Harry would have screamed, but he couldn't make a sound</u>. Where there should have been a back to Quirrell's head, there was a <u>face</u>, the most terrible <u>face</u> Harry had ever seen. <u>It</u> was <u>chalk white</u> with glaring <u>red eyes</u> and <u>slits for nostrils</u>, like a snake [5, p. 315].

The elements of this SPU are semantically integrated by semantic relations of 1) *cause* between two sentences where the second postpositive sentence (*Where there should have been a back to Quirrell's head, there was a face, the most terrible face Harry had ever seen*) explains what Harry's reaction (*Harry would have screamed, but he couldn't make a sound*) is caused by; 2) *explanation* between the second and the third sentences within SPU where the third sentence (*It was chalk white with glaring red eyes and slits for nostrils, like a snake*) explains and depicts what kind of the most terrible face Harry had seen (*It was chalk white with glaring red eyes and slits for nostrils, like a snake*). The latter is related to the lexeme *face* of the prepositive sentence due to the manifestation of *comparative cohesion*, since the lexeme *face* is compared to *chalk*, and its parts (*red eyes and slits for nostrils*) are compared to those of a snake.

3) <u>Communicative level markers</u>: question-answer relations (wh-questions, interrogative sentences as exclamative, rhetoric questions); fictive commands, assertions, conditionals, apologies etc.; metaphor, metonymy as a production and interpretation of fictive interaction; markers of evaluation (direct speech compounds which present an individual, action, mental (emotional) state, feeling, mood, attitude, principle, desire, intention,

attempt, reason, purpose etc.); discourse particles, vocatives, interjections, interactional words, truncations etc.; deictic tense, deictic pronouns and deictic demonstratives to describe time and place; culture specific words, cultural realities, cultural terms which reveal the author's cultural background [4]:

And to Harry's horror, a <u>voice</u> answered, and the <u>voice</u> seemed to come from Quirrell himself.

'<u>Use the boy</u> … <u>Use the boy</u> …'
Quirrell rounded on Harry.
'Yes – Potter – <u>come here</u>' [5, p. 314].

The components of the sentences within the analysed SPU are formally, semantically and communicatively structured by fictive cohesive conversational pattern of command when the Dark Lord (to be more exact, his *voice* – metonymy (synecdoche)) places Quirrell his order *to use the boy* and make him look at his reflection in the Mirror of Erised in order to spot the Philosopher's Stone – Elixir of Life – which Voldemort was willing to possess to be reborn at last. One more command (*come here*) is being made by Quirrell.

As a consequence, in the outlined study we have specified formal, semantic, communicative tools of the category of the addresser (determined by the markers of the coherence category realization on all these text levels) text grammar which help qualify the latter as a core category for text linguistic, communicative and social development. Overall, it is the addresser (author) who, consciously or unconsciously choosing this or that language unit to verbally shape his communicative intention, embodies situational motivations in it, recognizes himself by reflecting his emotional and mental states as well as predicts a reader's reactive capacity.

Bibliography:

1. Загнітко А. Граматика тексту: мовносоціумні категорії. *Записки з українського мовознавства*. 2022. Вип. 29. С. 149–164.

2. Andrushchenko V. The Literary Text in Aspect of Its Communicative Structure: A Theoretical Perspective. *Linguistic Studies*. 2023. Vol. 45. P. 54–62.

3. Halliday M., Webster, J. Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse. Vol. 2. London ; New York : Continuum, 2002. 301 p.

4. Pascual E. Fictive Interaction: The Conversation Frame in Thought, Language, and Discourse: Human Cognitive Processing. Vol. 47. Amsterdam / Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2014. 257 p.

5. Rowling J. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone. London : Bloomsbury, 2014. 332 p.