Біскуб Ірина. Діагностична категоризація в дискурсі програмного забезпечення. У статті запропоновано новий підхід до розуміння феномену когнітивної категоризації в сучасній когнітивній лінгвістиці. На матеріалі англомовного дискурсу програмного забезпечення встановлено особливості діагностичної категоризації, яка сприяє розумінню функціонального потенціалу прикладних програм через прочитання їх визначень у діалогових вікнах, що надає графічний інтерфейс. Виявлено відмінності між категоризацією за характерними ознаками й категоризацією за унікальними ознаками, яку визначаємо як діагностичну категоризацію. Доведено, що в сучасному англомовному дискурсі програмного забезпечення саме діагностичну категоризацію покладено в основу метафоричного мапування, завдяки якому користувач опановує функціональний потенціал комп'ютерної програми через взаємодію з її графічним інтерфейсом. Діагностичну категоризацію вважаємо також когнітивною стратегією, основне завдання якої – відокремлення несуттєвих категоризаційних ознак під час ідентифікації функцій програмного забезпечення. Це сприяє оптимізованому використанню графічних ітерфейсів комп'ютерних програм як інструменту ведення діалогу користувача й комп'ютерної системи.

Ключові слова: категоризація, концепт, знання, визначення, пізнання.

Бискуб Ирина. Диагностическая категоризация в дискурсе программного обеспечения. В статье предложен новый подход к пониманию феномена когнитивной категоризации в современной когнитивной лингвистике. На материале современного англоязычного дискурса программного обеспечения были установлены особенности диагностической категоризации, которая содействует пониманию функционального потенциала прикладных программ путем прочтения определений в диалоговых окнах, которые предлагаются графическим интерфейсом. Предложены различия между категоризацией по характерным признакам и категоризацией по уникальным признакам, определенной нами как диагностическая категоризация. Доказано, что именно диагностическая категоризация лежит в основе метафорического перенесения значения в дискурсе программного обеспечения, благодаря чему пользователь осваивает функциональный потенциал компьютерной программы, взаимодействуя с ее графическим интерфейсом. Диагностическую категоризацию считаем также когнитивной стратегией, главным заданием которой есть отделение несущественных категоризационных черт во время идентификации функций программного обеспечения. Это спросоствует оптимизированному использованию графических интерфейсов компьютерных программ как инструмента ведения диалога пользователя и компьютерной системы.

Ключевые слова: категоризация, концепт, знания, определение, познание.

Lyudmyla Bulatetska

FROM COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES
TO PRAGMATIC MOTIVATIONS

The article deals with the notion of involvement, which has the dynamic nature and varies within the boundaries of empathy, sympathy, (self)withdrawal, antipathy. Involvement is defined as a cognitive notion with the prevailing characteristics of cognitive distancing or approximation in interaction. Generally recognized is the point of view that involvement is a gradual phenomenon. It fluctuates depending on the activity of interlocutors. What follows from it is the absolute mutual trust of communicative partners to one another on the one hand or giving up and disregard the communication by both sides on the other. Such a shift of communicative parameters of communicative activity is a direct reflection of the change in the focus of orientation which directly depends on the focus of interest. The general vision of involvement is widening and depends on what goes to the focus of orientation. Existing approaches are reduced to the following three: a) involvement of the speaker and listener to the information of the topic (as individual participants); b) involvement of the community members (as mass participants); c) involvement of the topic on the parameter of its informativity and validity of the problem. Degrees of involvement are controlled by the communicative strategies of interlocutors, they re-frame the configuration of notions of empathy, sympathy, (self)withdrawal and antipathy, assisting in achievement of maximal communicative result and coincidence of positions of opposite sides.

Key words: involvement, intention, focus of orientation, vantage point, empathy, sympathy, (self)withdrawal, antipathy, prediction, anticipation, dynamic equilibrium.

Formulation of the research problem and its significance. Involvement as a communicative entity is determined by the degree of mutual interaction of interlocutors directed towards effective

functioning of the common topic [11, p. 463]. There are no grounds to speak about monosemantic interpretation of the topic in the linguistic literature. D. Tannen defines it in the terms of the style of speaking [17, p. 63]: if the interlocutors do not leave much time for the interreply pause and one of them starts to speak when his partner is still speaking, then communication with practically absent interreply pauses D. Tannen qualifies as high involvement. In such cases the communicative partners do not care much about their "positive face". But as soon as the tempo of speech is slowing down and interreply pauses become more distinct the partners do not illustrate great interest to the topic, they lower their emotional excitement or even indefinite attitude to it.

Analysis of previous research dealing with this problem. Emotional unbalance is easily identified in the context of the dialogue, but verbalized explication of such a form of involvement is measured due to different priorities in the monologue, it is fixed due to different parameters. For instance, involvement as one of the main features of fiction is a component of emotivity which is revealed due to the explication of emotional intentions of the author related to his own comprehension of the topic [3, p. 38]. As for the prominence of emotional comprehension of the topic, there are two regimes [9, p. 341]: from involvement to the complete alienation. The regime of involvement is more subjectivized, as a rule it coincides with the narration from the first person but turning of the perspective of topic representation to the 3rd person marks communicative distanciation moving away from alienation or neutrality and uncertainty of the position of the speaker. Bringing to the light the author's objectivity agrees with his unpreconceived real position (unprejudice). Nevertheless the person's detachment from the described events is not typical because it becomes impersonal [3, p. 41].

Presentation of the basic content of the research and an interpretation of the results which were obtained. Generally recognized is the point of view that involvement is a gradual phenomenon. It fluctuates depending on the activity of interlocutors. What follows from it is the absolute mutual trust of communicative partners to one another on the one hand or giving up and disregard the communication by both sides on the other. Such a shift of communicative parameters of communicative activity is a direct reflection of the change in the focus of orientation which directly depends on the focus of interest. The general vision of involvement is widening and depends on what goes to the focus of orientation [17, p. 63; 7, p. 280]. Existing approaches are reduced to the following three:

a) involvement of the speaker and listener to the information of the topic (as individual participants);

b) involvement of the community members (as mass participants);

c) involvement of the topic on the parameter of its informativity and vitality of the problem.

So involvement is a multimeasured entity, a skilful manipulation by verbal and non-verbal means of it stimulates the process of communication. It absolutely agrees with the perspective of description of the topic discussed, it regulates the communicative distance between interlocutors: the more distanced they are from one another (because of the divergence in evaluation of the topic) the more complicated is identification of their common focus of orientation.

Focus of orientation (vantage point) (the term of A. Glaz [13, p. 270]) is investigated as a dynamic component which is able to regulate the distance that can become longer or shorter and thus to approximate the position of communicative partners. If the topic is in the dominant vantage point it represents the objectivized point of view, but if the attention of interlocutors covers only partially the discussed topic then their points of view become considerably subjectivized: communicative distance becomes longer and involvement to communication doesn't bring to the recessive vantage. Effective manipulation by verbal/non-verbal means is a permanent change of the viewpoint on a particular notion. The corresponding strategies become effective if they produce the same focus of orientation in the opposing sides. If it happens then the focus of orientation comes close to the focus of empathy or to the coincidence of both. In the absolute agreement of both we receive absolute involvement [10, p. 267]. As it was mentioned involvement is fixed on the scale of graduality so it is modified not due to the binary opposition because of its continuity and non-discreteness. Mutually

dependent configuration "involvement (1) – communicative distance (2) – emotivity (3)" has the same common ground – topic. Due to their maximal agreement (1–3) topic receives the referential prominence [1, 18] and, as a consequence, the desired communicative effect is achieved.

The change of the focus of orientation means the change in the priorities reflected in the structure of the topical field [2, p. 6]. Means of such reorientation directed on the new object as on a new object of involvement are considerably verified. The most demonstrative among them are verbal like cleft and pseudocleft sentences:

*I expect **Jane** to meet you → It is **me** who expects Jane to meet you → It is **you** whom I expect Jane will meet.*

The change of word-order and the corresponding syntactic transformations illustrate foregrounding [18, p. 156–173] of the topic (in our example Jane – me – you).

Due to its unstability and regular fluctuation involvement becomes qualified as a dynamic entity not only on the parameter of distance but also on the parameter of emotivity [8, p. 324]: antipathy (1) – (self)withdrawal (2) – sympathy (3) – empathy (4).

The entities 1–4 are dependent as for the regime of their involvement. Antipathy always brings to conflict and delimitation of interaction as a proof that the priorities of communicative partners do not agree, the more so: conflict ruins the declared intentions because communicative partners have different systems of value. It finds its reflection in different models of comprehension. In the common communicative space strategies for involvement are ignored, the concession for the compromise is rejected. All together the positive image of the opposite side is ruined, implicitly or explicitly it is illustrated as a negative evaluation of the opponent. Deviation or even negation of the point of view and vantage point occurs in such a way which brings to the rejection not only his position but even him himself.

Illustration of antipathy on this scheme is a dialogue as a hostile interrogation, mockery, ascribing the opposite side the intentions which are reluctant to be admitted. It is a kind of code switching by one side because of the conflict of intentions. Differences in intentions of opposite sides illustrate differences in the intensity of involvements, divergence of viewpoints and termination of communication.

Selfwithdrawal, as a rule, is not so much emotionally coloured in discourse as antipathy. It is a kind of a strategy for the avoiding illustration of the weak involvement as different from antipathy as a strong illustration of one's confronting intention. Selfwithdrawal provokes conflict, it is characterized by the inherent ambivalency [6, p. 24]. Ambivalent illustration of selfwithrawal corresponds to the speech acts which do not provoke conflict because they do not show direct reference in the actualized situation [16, p. 279], they neutralize involvement. The most convincing proof of selfwithrawal is the change of the illocutionary force thanks to the abstracted sentences and precedented utterances [5, p. 322; 4, p. 107]. The above mentioned utterances serve as a signal of metaphorical code switching. The result of such operations is that a topic moves to the background. It is important to differentiate withdrawal and selfwithdrawal: if a communicative partner is able to feel the effect of the possible conflict and he himself withdraws (deviates) from active interaction such a behaviour is qualified as selfwithdrawal. But if the other participants take the speaker away from the topical field and from interactional space because of lack of his own anticipation of conflict it means withdrawal (explicit or implicit). In such a configuration of interaction its active participant receives the status of the outsider that is a result of reframing the model of the communicative situation: the released slot of the semantic role of agent does not remain empty, it is compensated by the outsider, who now obtains the status of the active participant. Provoked reframing of the situation, due to the shift of semantic roles demonstrates an operation of equilibrium which is regularly repeated. It is an obligatory dynamic feature of involvement.

Sympathy and empathy as the obligatory successive measurements on the scale of involvement are analysed in comparison because of their partial similarity and mutual dependence [12, p. 207], but their identification made with the terminology of emotivity is somewhat different. Sympathy is defined on the basis of direct dyadic relations I (1) – you (2) and it illustrates approximation of

positions and positive relations between participants of communication [14, p. 138]. The most salient form of sympathy is compassion. As for empathy, it is depicted by the pattern of triadic relations: I (1) – you (2) – I (I =you) (3); one own's feelings (1) – the feelings of the communicative partner (2) – the feelings of the communicative partner but through his own system of their comprehension (3). Empathy is vividly illustrated in the discourse as a presupposition of the addressee [12, p. 207]. Our understanding of empathy coincides with the opinion of A. Wierzbicka [19, p. 207], she treats empathy as anticipation, prognozing the feelings of other people. An empathizing partner doesn't see his aim to criticize [15, p. 133]. It is a signal for mutual understanding and it gives the chance for introduction of the mental space of the partner into his own mental space and foundation in the result of it of their common topical field. So, empathy is the ability to put oneself in the place of another person, it is an imaginary projection of one's own consciousness into the consciousness of another person, it is even an intention to assimilate oneself with this person.

At this projection of spaces and fields the communicative and psychological distances between interlocutors is minimal and involvement to communicative interaction is maximal. The speaker approves the communicative behaviour of his partner, he is willing to accept his psychological state, even if this state is deeply stressful the person is ready to sacrifice his own interests for the sake of the other person. So sympathy and empathy are strong markers of involvement. Blending of spaces is an obligatory strategy of both.

Though empathy and sympathy exist simultaneously in mental spaces of different people but the forms of their verbalization are usually different: empathy as a rule, fixes the open illustration of approval of the other people, even in the critical situation the empathizing person is willing to justify the acts of the empathized. Sympathy also illustrates approval but it is not planned beforehand in order to show it openly. In the state of empathy the speaker is ready to become responsible for the other person even for his mistakes (I=you=I(you)). As for sympathy, the open illustration of selfsacrifice is not observed (I=you≠I(you)). Sympathy signals selfsacrifice of one's own interests [12, p. 205]. In communication it is a kind of skilful manipulation by pronouns I, we, you. They fix approximation I (we) = you or distancing I (we) ≠ you. It is a kind of inclusive/exclusive we/I.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. As it was proved, involvement is a kind of manipulation by emotive entities (empathy, sympathy, withdrawal, antipathy) in their different configurations. Interference of the focuses of orientation of interlocutors is at the same time merging of the foci of their interest**.** It is achieved due to the communicative interaction of its participants in their common interactive space and topical field. The vantage point becomes common for both sides and an effective point of global orientation.

References

1. Булатецкая Л. И. Топикальность и ее реализация в тексте (на материале современного английского языка) : дис. … канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / Л. И. Булатецкая ; Киев. гос. пед. ин-т иностр. яз. – К. : [б. и], 1985. – 204 с.

2. Воронцова Н. Г. Комунікативно-когнітивні особливості вербальної інтеракції зі стороннім реципієнтом (на матеріалі англійської мови) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 / Н. Г. Воронцова ; Львів. нац. ун-т ім. І. Франка. – Л. : [б. в.], 2005. – 20 с.

3. Гладьо С. В. Эмотивность художественного текста: семантико-когнитивный аспект : дис. … канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / С. В. Гладьо ; Київ. держ. лінгвіст. ун-т. – К. : [б. в.], 2000. – 221 с.

4. Гудков Д. Теория и практика межкультурной коммуникации / Д. Гудков. – М. : Гнозис, 2003. – 287 с.

5. Левицкий В. В. Семасиология / В. В. Левицкий. – Винница : Новая кн., 2006. – 509 с.

6. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика : термінологічна енцикл. / О. О. Селіванова. – Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2006. – 716 с.

7. Besnier N. Involvement in Linguistic Practice: An Ethnographical Appraisal / Niko Besnier // An Interdisciplinary Monthly of Language Studies : Journal of Pragmatics. – 1994. – № 22. – P. 279–299.

8. Bulatetska L. Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Means of Regulation the Distance between Interlocutors / Lyudmila Bulatetska // Cognitive Linguistics Today. – Switzerland : Peter Lang, 2002. – P. 321–327.

9. Caffi C. Toward a Pragmatics of Emotive Communication / C. Caffi, R. W. Janney // An Interdisciplinary Monthly of Language Studies : Journal of Pragmatics. – 1994. – № 22. – P. 325–383.

10. Carter D. Discourse Focus Tracking // Abduction, Belief and Context in Dialogue : Studies in Computational Pragmatics / Eds. H. Bunt, W. Black. – Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : Benjamins, 2000. – P. 265–278.

11. Cooker D. The Nature of Conversational Involvement and Nonverbal Encoding Patterns / D. Cooker, J. Burgon // Human Communication Research. – 1987. – № 13 (4). – P. 463–494.

12. Dressler W. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs-1976 / W. Dressler, M. Barbaressi. – Berlin ; N.Y., 1994. – 682 p.

13. Glaz A. Embodiment and Point of View in Vantage Point / Adam Glaz // Further Insights into Semantics and Lexicography / Eds. ulf Magnusson, H. Cardela & Adam Glaz. – Lublin : WUMCS, 2007. – P. 265–277.

14. Leech J. Principles of Pragmatics / Joffrey Leech. – London : Longman, 1983. – 250 p.

15. Levinson S. Pragmatics / Stephen Levinson. – Cambridge : CUP, 1983. – 420 p.

16. Little J. Theories of Human Communication / J. Little. – Belmont, Albany : WPC, 2001. – 409 p.

17. Tannen D. Gender and Discourse / Deborah Tannen. – N.Y. : Oxford University Press, 1996. – 227 p.

18. Ungerer F. An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics / F. Ungerer, H. J. Schmid. – London ; N.Y. : Longman, 1999. – 306 p.

19. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics; the Semantics of Human Interaction / Anna Wierzbicka. – Berlin ; N.Y. : de Gruyter, 1991. – 502 p.

Булатецька Людмила. Від комунікативних стратегій до прагматичних мотивацій. У статті розглядається комунікативна сутність ЗАЛУЧЕННЯ як градуальної величини, яка видозмінюється в діапазоні: емпатія – симпатія – (само)усунення – антипатія. Залученість визначається як когнітивна сутність із переважальними характеристиками на нестабільність комунікативної дистанції. Загальновизнаною є точка зору про те, що залученість – це градуальне явище. Його флактуація залежить від комунікативної активності комунікантів. Як результат отримуємо абсолютну взаємну довіру партнерів, з одного боку, і відмову та недовіру один до одного – з іншого. Такий зсув параметрів комунікативної активності – пряме відображення в зміні фокусу орієнтації, що безпосередньо залежить і від фокусу зацікавленості. Загальне бачення залученості розширюється і залежить від того, що попадає в промінантне поле. Нинішні підходи зводяться до трьох наступних: а) залученість мовця і слухача до предмета думки мовця (індивідуальні учасники); б) залученість членів колективу (учасники мовного співтовариства); в) залученість самого предмету думки мовця за параметром його інформативності й актуальності проблеми. Ступінь залученості контролюється стратегіями комунікантів, завдяки яким рефреймується конфігурація емпатії, симпатії, (само)усунення й антипатії. Це сприяє досягненню максимального комунікативного результату за збігом позицій протилежних сторін.

Ключові слова: залученість, інтенція, фокус орієнтації, точка відрахунку, симпатія, емпатія, (само)усунення, антипатія, передбачуваність, очікуваність, динамічний еквілібріум.

Булатецкая Людмила. От коммуникативных стратегий к прагматическим мотивациям. В статье рассматривается вовлекаемость как градуальная категория, которая видоизменяется в диапазоне: эмпатия – симпатия – (само)устранение – антипатия. Вовлекаемость определяется и как когнитивная сущность с преобладающими характеристиками на нестабильность коммуникативной дистанции между коммуникативными партнерами. Вовлеченность определяем как когнитивную сущность с преобладающими характеристиками нестабильности коммуникативной дистанции. Общепризнанной является точка зрения о том, что вовлекаемость – это градуальное явление. Его флактуация зависит от коммуникативной активности коммуникантов. Как результат получаем абсолютно взаимное доверие партнеров, с одной стороны, и отказ и недоверие друг к другу – с другой. Такое смещение параметров коммуникативной активности является прямым отражением в изменении фокуса ориентации и напрямую зависит от фокуса интереса. Общее видение вовлекаемости расширяется и зависит от того, что попадает в проминантное поле. Существующие подходы сводятся к трем следующим: а) вовлеченность говорящего и слушателя к предмету мысли говорящего (индивидуальные участники); б) вовлеченность говорящего и слушателя к предмету мысли говорящего (индивидуальные участники); в) вовлеченность самого предмета мысли говорящего по параметру его информативности и актуальности проблемы. Степень вовлеченности контролируется стратегиями коммуникантов за счет которых рефреймируется конфигурация эмпатии, симпатии, (само)устранения и антипатии. Это способствует достижению максимального коммуникативного результата при совпадении позиций противоположных сторон.

Ключевые слова: вовлекаемость, интенция, фокус ориентации, точка отсчета, симпатия, эмпатия, (само)устранение, антипатия, предвидение, ожидаемость, динамический эквилибриум, флактуация.