

SECTION 5. UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

10.46299/ISG.2025.MONO.PED.2.5.1

5.1 Refusal utterances as a part of person's communication

The anthropological approach to language learning has intensified scholars' interest in the personality and social aspects of speakers' activities. Taking various personal and socio-cultural aspects of the communication process into account has made it possible to implement and interpret certain language communication strategies. 'Whereas traditional linguistics focused on linguistic objects such as texts, sentences and words, activity linguistics (which primarily concerns pragmatics in the broad sense) originates from individuals, their needs, motives, goals, intentions and expectations, and their practical and communicative actions and situations in which they participate as either initiators and leaders or performers of 'supporting roles' [73, p. 11].

The pragmatic approach to linguistic research has led to the publication of works by domestic linguists focusing on the social aspects of discourse and the role of personality in communication. Examples include the work of N. V. Pavlyk, O. G. Pirozhenko, O. O. Selivanova and M. M. Teleki [79-81, 83.].

In psychology, the concept of 'communication' can be interpreted in various ways: as an exchange of thoughts, feelings and experiences; as a type of human activity; or as a specific form of social communication. Highlighting the complexity and multifaceted nature of communication, N. V. Pavlyk [79] notes that it can be both an informational process and an interpersonal interaction involving empathy, mutual understanding, and the influence of one person on another. Communication is based on the exchange of information between at least two people. Communication partners address each other as the only listeners in a given situation and under specific circumstances. The interlocutor focuses only on their specific language partner, and the content of the dialogue is interesting only to them, so communication is an intersubjective connection and the free interaction of unique individuals. Human

communication is based on the deep dialectic of the differences and similarities between partners, who strive not for unification, but for harmony and the reasonable coexistence of different opinions during conversation. The goal of communication is to create a shared intersubjective space of mutual understanding and harmony.

Communication is recognised as a special type of activity through which rational and social information is exchanged. S. Levinson [85, p. 47] notes that 'the activity of communication is the same kind of human activity as productive and cognitive activity. In psychological terms, it has the same fundamental organisation: it is intentional, motivated, and has a specific purpose; it is effective, and in this sense, we can talk about the degree to which the achieved result coincides with the goal; and it is normative, in that both the course and the result of the act of communication are subject to social control'. Language communication is understood as social influence on the interlocutor, in the form of a dichotomy: information communication versus interaction. Levinson defines interaction as 'the continuous production of sequences of interrelated speech by two or more communicators', each of whom controls and is controlled by the actions of the others [85, p. 44].

Theoretical understanding of language as a manifestation of human activity enables us to identify the constitutive characteristics of speech: needs, motives, goals and specific implementation conditions. The main purpose of communication, receiving and transmitting information, is carried out through the mechanisms of establishing, continuing and completing language contact. Therefore, communication, as the realisation of the cognitive function of transmitting information, necessarily involves accompanying metacommunication, which regulates language communication using the language itself. This is known as phatic metacommunication, in which the phatic function of ensuring contact is realised.

As an activity, phatic metacommunication is a manifestation of the addressee's need for social contact and involvement in joint activities, and it is a prerequisite for effective information exchange. Participants in social interaction aim to organise and regulate social contact; therefore, phatic metacommunication is interaction aimed at

establishing and maintaining interpersonal contact. This is in contrast to transactional communication, which is the process of transferring cognitive information.

Depending on the purpose and context of the communication, phatic metacommunication can be either supplementary or self-contained. The former accompanies transactional speech communication during the establishment, maintenance and termination of speech contact. The latter occurs when communication is an end in itself. Indeed, the system of phatic metacommunication is a dialectical interplay between the potentially subordinate and the primary elements, depending on the communication's purpose and the discourse situation. Phatic utterances are rarely found in their pure form; rather, they can be seen as carriers of dual information, combining elements about the addressee's emotions and a phatic metacommunicative setup. For example, a question functions to establish speech contact and attract the interlocutor's attention.

Communication is an intersubjective interaction embodied in a system of signs [86, p. 142], implying the presence of two aspects: content and emotion. The transactional discourse aspect of communication is used to transmit information or a message. Interactive discourse regulates interpersonal relations [86, p. 205–206]. According to Vinokur, the communicative need for emotional contact is satisfied by phatic communication.

The essence of phatic communication is interpreted in different ways. The term 'phatic communication' was introduced to the scientific community by the English ethnologist B. K. Malinowski in 1923. While studying the speech behaviour of a Melanesian tribe, Malinowski noted that silence was perceived as a sign of hostility and that speech, regardless of its thematic content or direction, relieved the unpleasant tension that arose between people. This is followed by greetings and a stream of speech consisting of meaningless statements, lists of unrelated events and comments on the obvious [16, pp. 297–332]. Malinowski concluded that such communicative acts (phatic communion) play a crucial role in society by facilitating the establishment of psychological contact between its members [Ibid.].

According to the scientist, the phatic function is one of the fundamental functions of language since it reveals its main purpose: to communicate, engage in polite conversation and create friendly relationships without conveying thoughts, ideas or information [16, pp. 151–152]. The researcher proposed considering the units of phatic communication as non-informative messages exchanged by interlocutors to maintain contact out of respect and politeness, or to break the silence. In other words, metacommunicative units are a means of serving the conversational process [Ibid].

In most works, the phatic function is described as 'ordinary friendly conversation' [88], 'small talk' [84] or 'talking about nothing' [87]. However, the essential aspect of this type of communication is the active expression by the speaker of their position regarding their desire or unwillingness to engage in contact, through expressing sympathy or dissatisfaction, understanding or misunderstanding, and searching for resonance, agreement or disagreement.

In phaticity, we observe the social function of the VV, which is produced through the phatic form of interaction. The dominant function in FS is the 'relational function', consisting not only of the speaker's attitude towards the listener, as expressed through the semantics of the utterance, but also of the linguistic processes involved in establishing, altering, managing and concluding social contact between communicators [88, p. 43].

In refusal utterances, the function of phatic communication can indicate a break in relations or the termination of a conversation. It can also demonstrate authoritarianism or incite hostility by humiliating the interlocutor. Alternatively, it can demonstrate solidarity between communicators and maintain contact in seemingly unfavourable situations by diplomatically preventing the partner's intention from being realised [78, p. 8] compare - *Зглянься! Змилуйся! Мій батько віддячить тобі сторицею!.. Не може вмерти цей лицар! Він — мій наречений! — Ха-ха! То ось яка ти дочка генерального обозного! — зловтішне просичав Кшемуський. — Це одна зграя... — Змилуйся! — не тямлячи себе, вокала Дарина, хапаючись за полу губернаторового жупана. — Зглянься, пане! — Ах ти, гадюка! — крикнув Кшемуський і затупотів ногами. — Мотузку на них обох! Тільки її спочатку*

прив'язати до стовпа, до шибениці, поки він не здохне... хай милується на свого коханця... а потім і її! (М. Starytskyi); [Галя:] Знаєш що? Ходім додому, розбудимо його, станем перед їм на коліна... Він нас простить: він мене любить. [Назар:] Хіба ж я його не просив, хіба ж не ставав перед ним на коліна! Адже ти бачила? (Т. Shevchenko). Different initial positions of the communicators generate different meta-senses. The confrontational discourse of refusal is characterised by initial dissatisfaction with interpersonal relations or a negative trend in their development. This pushes the communicator to perform certain speech acts and take actions aimed at breaking the system of relations. Specific linguistic means are chosen for this purpose and the 'mechanism of a destructive speech strategy' is activated. In contrast, the non-confrontational discourse of refusal is characterised by the speaker's satisfaction with their relationship with the communicative partner and their reluctance to break it by refusing.

Phatic conversations that occur at the interpersonal level provide an environment in which a linguistic worldview can emerge and develop through communicators' agreed or unagreed contributions to the 'eternal dialogue'. Contactivity is an interactive concept that implies cooperative dialogue proceeds according to the 'inducement' – 'ratification' scheme, and conflict dialogue according to the 'inducement' – 'rejection' scheme. Contactivity is the dominant concept in all discourses, regardless of whether relations are oriented towards harmonisation or disharmonisation. In a narrow sense, it is the coincidence or convergence of, or separation between, the communicative perspectives and emotional intentions of the communicators. In refusal utterances the speaker reacts (conflictively or non-conflictively) not to the denotative situation, but to the meaning generated by the emotional state and position of the speaker of the stimulus, comparing them with their own. The intention to refuse arises from the motive of inexpediency, and its intensity, reflecting the speaker's level of self-awareness, determines whether the refusal evolves into a conflict or non-conflict reaction [78, p. 18].

Operating within the realm of phatic communication, refusal utterances generate discourses in which the factor of interpersonal interaction becomes paramount, driven by the speaker's need for social and psychological contact.

Thus, we observe the social nature of the refusal utterances in the intersubjective communication of participants, where the dominant criterion is attitude.

Expressions of refusal represent an individual's intrapersonal state, manifested in the ego-directedness of their verbal discourse. The speaker's will is realised in their unwillingness to perform the requested action or accept imposed interests, motivated by psychological self-preservation mechanisms. The expression of will is reflected in the semantic features of voluntariness and undesirability, which determine the nature of the refusal.

The concept of 'unwillingness' is associated with the speaker's evaluative attitude towards phenomena in the real or unreal world. It is interpreted as an operator of optative evaluations that combines signs of will, interest, and potentiality, contrasting them with the actual. According to the aforementioned authors, the concept of '*unwillingness*' belongs to the '*semantic primitives*', and the meanings of '*I do not want*', '*I will not*', '*I do not wish*', '*I cannot*' are indefinable due to the indecomposability of the meaningful unit and the impossibility of presenting an exhaustive definition without resorting to tautology. Therefore, the meanings of '*do not want*', '*will not*', '*do not wish*' and '*cannot*' are derived through their antonyms '*want*', '*will*', '*wish*' and '*can*'. Therefore, the operator 'unwillingness' is defined as a negative predicative sign of the speaker's intention, revealing the individual's negative attitude towards situations they encounter [78, p. 17].

Evaluative expressions are components of the pragmatic aspect of communication — an inherent value that manifests itself in various areas of speech. 'In evaluation, the semantic and pragmatic aspects are inseparable; all aspects of its functioning reflect the fusion of semantics (the intrinsic meaning of linguistic units, including utterances) and pragmatics (the conditions for implementing the communication process)' [75, p. 207]. Evaluation is an opinion about an object expressed in terms of a value category, and value is anything of interest, desire or

aspiration.

As a manifestation of active reactions to the world around us, evaluation is an attributable subjective feature since the axiological process depends on the speaker, who is the bearer of a system of standards (i.e. a system of values) [Zhayvoronok 2007, p. 6]. 'The universal system of values is somehow nourished through ethnic roots — national tastes, traditional ties of the ethnic group, its psychological characteristics, etc. [74, p. 45]. Therefore, evaluation is the result of a particular linguistic society's worldview, world perception, social interests, and fashion.

Evaluation categorises an individual's social activity at the motivational stage. The act of refusal is interpreted as rejecting imposed interests (such as will, beliefs and judgements), and as turning away from the 'alien' worldview and psychomental attitudes imposed by the partner.

In communicative refusal utterances, conflict arises from different assessments of reality by communicators. There are three types of assessment: truthful, axiological and emotional [73, p. 18]. Truthful evaluation forms the basis of communicative refusal utterances. It establishes the correctness of the imperative. The listener evaluates the imperative's legitimacy through the category of modality. In communicative refusal utterances, the axiological evaluations of the speaker and listener contradict each other due to differences in their knowledge base. These evaluations form the basis for refusal and are represented by opposing modes. Emotional evaluation is considered the primary expression of one of the aforementioned evaluations and precedes the further development of the evaluative component of the utterance in communicators' speech and thought activity [73].

The categories of evaluation and emotionality are hierarchically related. Emotionality is subordinate to evaluation: emotions arising from evaluations reveal the subject's attitude to reality. The emotional components of value can intensify the evaluation. However, evaluation does not always involve emotional colouring; it can be both emotional and rational. The pragmatic features of evaluation determine its connection with expressiveness, which is mainly manifested in emotional evaluations.

There are two types of expressiveness in language: Objective (intrinsic) expressiveness occurs when the use of emotionally charged words is independent of the relationship between the participants in the communication act (affect situation). Subjective (directed) expressiveness occurs when a positive or negative attitude towards events or another participant in the communication is expressed.

These categories refer to different phenomena: emotionality reflects human feelings and experiences, while expressiveness is the result of conscious human activity that enhances language imagery. It should be noted that language expression is not always emotional. Emotionality is considered the psychological essence of linguistic personality because emotional evaluation, unlike rational evaluation, is based on specific irrational foundations and enhances the latter. Emotionality is a linguistic category because emotions are evoked and transmitted through speech and language. In other words, it is a semantic property of language that enables emotionality to be expressed as a psychological phenomenon [76, p. 248].

Although rejection is often associated with dissatisfaction, in some situations the person rejecting someone may do so to express respect and emphasise the importance of their partner's desires and needs, comp.: — *І нащо тобі, Науме, той ланок? — говорив жид... — Добрі б гроші дав... — Годі! Сказано — **не продам*** (А. Konskyi) і *Мазайло увів Баронову-Козину. Зачинив Мокієві двері. Тоді до Баронові: Починайте, будь ласка! Баронова-Козино захвилювалась: — Починати? Ах, Боже мій, — починати... Може, ви почнете? Мазайло теж захвилювався: — **Ні! Ні! Я тепер не можу, ви — моя вчителька. Починайте ви!*** (М. Kulish).

Irony is one way of expressing a negative assessment. The evaluation conveyed by ironic statements is characterised by pragmatic ambiguity, which is caused by a discrepancy between the literal meaning of the message and its intended meaning. Therefore, irony is an indirect means of expressing a refusal.: [*Мати (уїдливо):*] *Пора ж тобі коровицю здоїти, / оту молочну, турського заводу, / що ти ще за небіжчика придбала. / [Килина:] Я тії подою, що тут застала, / та націджу три краплі молока — / хунт масла буде* (Lesia Ukrainka); *Чи не можна, — питаю, — у вас молочка? — Е! Молочка?! “Не видоїли бичка!” — відповідає Максимиха*

(Ostap Vyshnia).

Subject-oriented and object-oriented statements are distinguished depending on the direction of expression of evaluation. Subject-oriented expressions convey the speaker's attributes and states caused by the addressee's communicative behaviour. Such expressions are peculiar in that the author and the subject of speech are the same person, a fact that is explicitly reflected in the lexical and grammatical structure of the expression.: *[Заброда:] Як я ненавиджу тебе!.. [Скидан:] Не маю і я приязні до тебе, Забродо* (A. Dovzhenko).

Object-oriented statements express how the speaker characterises the addressee's qualities, properties, actions and deeds. In such expressions, the author and speaker are distinct individuals. The addressee is explicitly represented in the lexical and grammatical structure of the utterance, and can be evaluated as either a general person or by specific criteria. *Чи бач, погань розхристана, / Байстря необуте! / Ти вже виросла, дівуєш, / З хлопцями гуляєш — / Постривай же, ось я тобі!..* (T. Shevchenko).

Depending on whether the evaluation is positive or negative, we distinguish between general positive, general negative, and partially positive or partially negative statements. Negative evaluations are more frequent in communicative refusal utterances. The qualities and actions of the evaluated object determine aspects of negative evaluation, causing the speaker's negative attitude. The axiological aspect of a general evaluative judgement encompasses a negative evaluation of the addressee as a whole, combining a set of features that create a general characteristic of the object. In the case of a general assessment, the object is characterised as bad, disgusting or worthy of contempt or condemnation etc: *Я сватав її, а вона мене відкинула! ...Вона мені каже: "Іди, дурню, йди! Я ще не наїлася дурних грибів, аби за тебе піти!"* (O. Kobylianska). The aspect of a negative partial evaluation statement is based on one of the features of the object (property, quality, act or state of the addressee): — *Треба прохати, щоб він [губернатор] зараз прислав козаків. — Вибачай, Соню, ти говориш дурниці* (M. Kotsiubynsky).

Depending on how negative evaluations are presented, expressions can be

categorised as having either direct or indirect negative evaluations of the addressee. Direct negative evaluative statements characterise the addressee's physical, moral, emotional, mental, social and socio-cultural properties and qualities. Using indirect language helps to soften the categorical nature of a negative judgement, establishing a calm, conflict-free style of communication. Comp.: *[Вона:] А можна подивитися? Будь ласка... [Він:] Ні, не можна. Я невірноваженим жінкам зброю не даю... (Неда Неждана); [Кім:] Як сумніваєшся — можемо піти і подивитися. [Киця:] Брр... Який ти похабник... Я не піду (Неда Неждана) і [Руфін:] Я б за щастя вважав, якби ти в мене оселився. [Прісцилла:] Ми ж, таточку, давно тебе просили. [Аецій Панса:] Е ні, не вдався я до того зроду, щоб тут у Римі жити. Не тепер мені й звикати (Lesiua Ukrainka).*

The category of evaluation is inextricably linked to the concepts of measurement, degree and gradation. The rating scale comprises four zones: the neutral zone (0), the negative zone (-), the positive zone (+) and the zone of normality, which forms part of the positive zone (+). The definition of the neutral valuation zone is somewhat arbitrary, given that it is difficult to conceive of objects that are never subject to valuation. The neutral zone potentially includes objects that are not usually characterised as 'good' or 'bad'. The neutral zone can also include objects characterised by evaluation. In language, there are certain indicators that an object is generally or specifically outside the speaker's sphere of evaluation. These are linguistic units with semantics indicating indifference or a lack of interest. Negative evaluation is a characteristic of VVs, though it is occasionally found in other areas. Comp.: — *Я з тобою, княже, — нагадав Коснятин. — Ти не в лік. Грубий еси й плотояден (Р. Zahrebelnyi); — І од того, що ви не скажете правди, вашому чоловікові не полегшає... Сто чортів! Третій день ганяємося, а тут... Та ви знаєте, з ким маєте справу?! Петровський — політичний злочинець. — Це нас не цікавить, пане ротмістр, — мовила спокійно Ольга Петрівна (М. Olyinyk); [Провожатий:] Я йому кажу: ходім, дядюшка, у волость, — а він і не слуха. “Іди, — каже, — коли тобі треба, я там нічого не забув”, — та й пішов собі другою дорогою убік (І. Karpenko-Karyi).*

The rating scale has two points, extending in positive and negative directions. Each direction has a hierarchical structure, ranging from less intense to more intense values. A speaker's position on the scale is influenced by context, communicative intentions, and the pragmatic orientation of the text. Comp.: — *То, може б, ми знайшли квартиру? Теплу ще й з пансіоном! Довго Тарас мовчав. Не міг же він сказати, що вже самі ці стіни — благо, яким він снів не рік, не два за Каспієм... Ат, якось тут перезимую, — махнув рукою байдуже* (В. Шевчук) і — *Відійди, студент! Улас зблід, голос його тремтів і ламався і — Ви порушуєте закон і конституцію. — Що? — закричав Гнат. — Геть! Я тут закон! Я — конституція* (Н. Тютунник).

The categorical nature of the assessment depends on communicative and pragmatic, socio-cultural and individual psychological factors: — *Товаришу, я вам забороняю... — Нічого ви мені не можете заборонити! Начхав я на ваші заборони. Ми — банда! Ми — грабіжники! Ми — вбійники!* (О. Іваненко); — *Поїдемо зі мною. На будову комунізму. — На фіга мені твій комунізм, — відказала, зареготавши. — Комунізм у Марфуші. Потрапила з Тверської прямо в Зоряне містечко. Космонавт свою законну покинув, на ній одружився. Живе, як у Бога за пазухою* (М. Bratan).

There are two main tendencies in de-intensification of assessment: increasing the subjectivity of assessment and reducing the intensity of the trait being assessed. The purposes of intensification and de-intensification are different (though not polar). In an ascending gradation of evaluation, the trait being evaluated is strengthened to increase its impact on the addressee. De-intensification performs a similar function: it helps to achieve the communicative goal by making an optimal impact on the interlocutor [6, pp. 10–11].

In the structure of CAV, the evaluative component is located in the 'zone of intersection of communicants' cognitive spaces' and the cognitive structures that form them — the knowledge bases — i.e. in the contradictions of the presupposition: — *Сашечко, останься дома, — благає мене мати. — Там так страшно в куцах! — Не страшно, мамо. — Там же ями в озерах! — Я не полізу в яму* (О. Dovzhenko);

— *Купіть, порятуйте!* — *Ніяково в такому разі купувати: людина в біді, а ти у неї купуєш; вона зопалу продає, а ти користуєшся. Ніяково... не похристиянськи, та й грошей у мене катма* (О. Konskyi).

The evaluation (usually negative) contained in the WS is directed at persons, objects or phenomena defined in previous (and less often, subsequent) speech acts (Sushynska, 1998, p. 48). In other words, it conveys the speaker's subjective attitude towards a part of their worldview, indicates the value attributes of the referent and determines whether their qualification complies with generally accepted social norms, using figurative elements (Boyko, 2007, p. 389). A subjective evaluative statement is a general reaction to an extralinguistic or communicative situation and establishes a tone of communication. It also marks the speaker's mood and indicates their unwillingness to cooperate, as well as their choice of strategies and tactics for either harmonious or disharmonious dialogue, comp.: — *Нічого не знаю! Годі базікати! Ви теж!* — *Я помічник капітана. Тут наказую я* (Р. Zahrebelnyi); — *Ходім — почуємо, що там нового нам братчики із Січі привезли. — Цікаво дуже! Шкода, що я не буду з вами* (І. Karpenko-Karyi).

The functional and semantic category of evaluation can be expressed explicitly and implicitly, comp: — *У Києв. — Якого біса?* (V. Mynko); — *Можє, я проведу аж до майстерні?* — *Хіба я дівка!* (V. Shevchuk); — *Миритися нам треба. Все життя як люті вороги живемо. Умиратимете — ніп причастя не дасть. — Мені плакати, а не тобі* (Н. Tyutyunnyk).

Evaluation is not only the result of cognition; it also takes into account the addressee's perspective. When adopting an evaluative stance, the speaker must be aware that the addressee is not interested in the evaluation itself, but in how it is interpreted. Therefore, all factors that ensure an adequate understanding of the statement must be taken into account. In order to perceive the evaluation expressed in the implicature appropriately, the recipient needs to be able to decode the implicit information creatively and to involve a sufficiently broad context [77].

In communicative refusal utterances, the clash of intentions (cooperative on the part of the addressee and non-cooperative on the part of the addressee) manifests itself

in different evaluations and consequently in communicators' attitudes towards the surrounding reality, each other and interlocutors' statements.

Thus, utterances function within the realm of phatic communication. They form discourses in which interpersonal interaction is the dominant factor, as speakers in everyday life feel a need for social and psychological contact through communication. Discourses of refusal are characterised by the negative intra-volitional state of the person issuing the refusal, which indicates their intentional state of self-consciousness and serves to prevent the realisation of the stimulus producer's intention.