

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2018.14.2.1>**ЭМОЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ ОБУСЛОВЛЕННОСТЬ РЕЧЕВОГО ПОВЕДЕНИЯ**

Научная статья

**Топка Л.В.\***

Иркутский государственный университет, Иркутск, Россия

\* Корреспондирующий автор (lavtop[at]list.ru)

**Аннотация**

Статья затрагивает проблему категоричного и некатегоричного речевого поведения, обусловленного определенным эмоциональным состоянием говорящего субъекта на примере чувств уверенности и неуверенности с точки зрения прототипического подхода к исследованию. Чувство неуверенности как реакция на такие базовые эмоции, как испуг и стыд, показывает неспособность человека им противостоять; чувство уверенности, в свою очередь, является способностью индивида контролировать как свое эмоциональное состояние, так и речевое поведение. Средством языковой репрезентации исследуемых феноменов выступают категоричное и некатегоричное высказывания.

**Ключевые слова:** речевое поведение, чувства, категоричность / некатегоричность, уверенность / неуверенность, прототипический сценарий.

**EMOTIONAL CONDITIONALITY OF VERBAL BEHAVIOUR**

Research article

**Топка Л.В.\***

Irkutsk State University, Irkutsk, Russia

\* Corresponding author (lavtop[at]list.ru)

**Abstract**

The relation between the categoricity and non-categoricity of verbal behaviour can be investigated through the opposition of their emotional or, rather, sensual, components – certainty and uncertainty phenomena, which are analyzed in terms of prototypical scenario. A feeling of uncertainty arises as a reaction to such basic emotions as fright and shame – social fears of a personal nature and displays person's inability to fight them. A feeling of certainty, in its turn, is a capability of a person to control negative emotions and to return to a stable emotional state. Certainty and uncertainty phenomena are realized on all levels of linguistic system, the means of their linguistic representation are, respectively, categorical and non-categorical statements.

**Keywords:** speech behaviour, feelings, categoricity / non-categoricity, certainty/uncertainty, prototypical scenario.

**Introduction**

Emotions or, rather, feelings are included in the structure of the individual and constitute the so-called 'personality profile' – a set of traits where among them there are certainty and uncertainty, self-confidence and obedience, tact and faux pas [8], as well as sensitivity/nervousness vs. security/confidence [3]. The verbal behaviour of a person is caused by his/her emotional state.

Categorical verbal behaviour (categoricity, overstatement) is characterized by confidence, peremptoriness, indelicacy, and tactlessness. The statement of a categorical person is clear and univocal; it can also be sharp, abrupt, rude and impolite. This is caused by two reasons, first: the existence of knowledge (true or full information) and, second: speaker's particular emotional state – feeling of self-confidence or over-confidence [12].

Psychological studies of the emotional stability of an individual describe different values of the categoricity factor: a high value of this factor is observed in people who do not have the flexibility, diplomacy, stick unabashed to their opinion, who are unable to see undertones and find reasonable compromises, who are often hysterical, rushing from extremes to extremes. A low value of this factor is associated with self-doubt, insecurity, passivity, inability or unwillingness to express unequivocally their desires and to make concrete decisions.

Non-categorical verbal behaviour (politeness, understatement), in its turn, displays uncertainty,

unpredictability, hesitancy, and courtesy [11]. The person with non-categorical verbal behaviour is insecure, feels uncertain that something is true; his/her discourse is categorized by ambiguity, polysemy, variability, and doubt due to the lack of reliable information (deficit in knowledge) or unstable emotional state.

The relation between the categoricity and non-categoricity of verbal behaviour can be investigated through the opposition of their nuclear emotional or, rather, sensual, components – certainty/confidence and uncertainty/insecurity, which are analyzed in terms of prototypical scenario.

**Method**

The necessity to move beyond the 'objectivistic approach' to the language on the one hand and an active development of various methods of analysis of the cognitive structures' correlation on the other one marked the emergence of prototype theory (see for instance: [9; 17].

Prototype can be interpreted from the psychological and cognitive viewpoints. In the first case it is 'the best model', 'central, or a typical element of the category'; prototypicality in the category, according to George Lakoff [6], lies in the fact that the central members of the category (closer to the prototype) in comparison with off-center ones display other cognitive characteristics: they are more quickly identified, more frequently used. From the cognitive viewpoint prototype is a stereotype, an ideal, a scheme, a concept that defines the content of the category the basis of which it

forms; it is, in terms of John R. Taylor [10], a central member of the category, a schematic representation of its (category) conceptual nucleus.

Emotions can be defined in terms of a prototypical situation and a prototypical reaction to it, at the heart of each of them there is a prototypical situation, which is understood as a characteristic of a typical situation in which a definite emotion arises. Since “the concept of ‘emotion’ is culture-bound and cannot be similarly relied on” and “the concept of ‘feeling’ is universal and can be safely used in the investigation of human experience and human nature”(see for the details: [14]), certainty and uncertainty phenomena, can also be analyzed from the prototypical point of view, to be exact in terms of prototypical scenario.

### Discussion

In Western European philosophy uncertainty as lack of knowledge is understood as a source of fear. According to Western philosophers, knowledge is a means of fear escape, since the lack of experience and ignorance of the individual determine fear's occurrence. The fears of the individual disappear or weaken as experience accustoms it to the manifestations of nature; he calms down as soon as recognizes or imagines that he recognizes the causes of the phenomena he observes and gets acquainted with the means to avoid their actions(see for example: [2; 7]). This is confirmed by the studies of linguists dealing with the problems of Germanic languages, in particular A. Wierzbicka, who studying the phenomena of certainty and uncertainty in English and German, speaks about certainty and Sicherheit as about confidence, security, safety (*certain / gewiss; certainty / gewissheit*) and about uncertainty as the opposite phenomenon, that causes fear [13; 15].

However, there is also the opposite point of view, which is usually associated with the name of the German-American philosopher Erich Fromm, according to his research the world around the individual, in particular the society, is hostile towards him [5]. Knowledge (experience, the benefits of civilization) alienates a person from a sense of confidence; a fear of losing what one has leads a person to anxiety and, as a consequence, to the uncertainty.

According to psychological studies, up to three years a person does not know a feeling of insecurity, because his personality has not developed yet (he has no experience), he has a feeling of confidence, he is protected by his ignorance (lack of knowledge). Then comes awareness (conscious knowledge) of his own imperfection (helplessness), fear appears and, therefore, a feeling of uncertainty. With the reception of “freedom of choice”, awareness of identity, isolation from something whole and holistic (primarily from the mother) a person gets feelings of anxiety and uncertainty. From this it follows that fear and uncertainty are caused by knowledge.

The researches of the ego-psychologist Erik H. Erikson display that in the second stage of personality development (autonomy and doubt / shame) from 1 year to 3 years (later infancy), in the normal line of developing, independence and confidence are formed, in anomalous line – doubt and hypertrophied sense of shame occur [4]. Therefore, uncertainty is the product of a person's socialization.

### Results

The scenarios of certainty and uncertainty take place in case of a specific, definite danger or threat, where fear causes a feeling of insecurity or self-confidence, and, as a consequence, non-categorical or categorical verbal behaviour.

In the English language, a prototypical scenario of certainty feeling includes such items as:

1. The emergence of danger (threat);
2. Fear or shame;
3. An afford/attempt to control negative emotion;
4. A successful attempt and, as a consequence, a feeling of confidence;
5. A return to a stable emotional state;

A short scheme of the scenario is *knowledge – overcoming fear – confidence – emotional stability*.

Certainty is the result of a victory over person's self-importance and fears.

The behaviour of a confident man represents inner strength, determination to perform certain actions and the resoluteness to carry it out. The signs of certainty can be either external (those that are accessible to the addressee or the observer): a direct fixed look, sure bodily movements, a straight back, an express and clear speaking, often in a loud voice, an obvious ability to stand up for oneself and one's belief; and internal ones (available in the sensations to the speaker himself): ability and / or willingness to make a decision, to give an order and to demand its fulfillment. For example, the prototypical paralinguistic representation of the order as a component of the certainty/confidence domain is, in our opinion, the “a pointing finger” – silent imperative.

Certainty phenomenon displays the existence of knowledge as well as a feeling of knowing (the existence of sureness). A man of certainty produces the statement, which, in his/her opinion, reflects the objective reality, so he/she is sure about its correctness and verity. That is why such a statement includes predicates of knowledge: *to know, be aware*, and of a stable emotional state: *be sure, be certain*. As a rule, such a statement is either an assertion (fact), where the nuclear grammatical unit is the forms of the Indicative Mood, or an inducement: order, requirement, demand, where the grammatical core is the forms of the Imperative Mood.

The prototypical scenario of uncertainty feeling, in its turn, unfolds as follows:

1. The emergence of danger (threat);
2. Fear or shame;
3. An afford/attempt to control negative emotion;
4. Unsuccessful attempt and as a result:
  - a) uncertainty, lack of confidence, emotional instability (panic, hysterics);
  - b) inhibition (stupor);
  - c) a feeling of overconfidence, the escalation of an unstable emotional state, aggressiveness, and categorical speech behaviour. Person's aggressiveness, in this case, is just a compensation for his/her feelings of insecurity.

A short scheme of the scenario is *knowledge – not overcoming fear – uncertainty – unstable emotional state*.

The behaviour of an uncertain person, as a rule, is characterized by a non-fixed gaze, crooked shoulders (the “hump” of guilt), quiet voice, slurred speech, ambiguity of expression. Prototypical paralinguistic representation of uncertainty is shrugging shoulders.

Since uncertainty has both an informational component (a deficit in knowledge) and a subjective component (a feeling of not knowing), as it was mentioned in the paper of Yoav Bar-Anan, Timothy D. Wilson, and Daniel T. Gilbert [1, P. 123], it is possible to speak about this phenomenon as an expression of distrust, disbelief and hidden objection, and as well as about indecision and hesitation of the speaker.

A man of uncertainty creates a non-categorical statement, which contains predicates of mental activity, opinion and supposition: *to think, be uncertain, doubt, suppose*; a predicate of knowledge in the negative form *I don't know*, as well as the predicate of fear *to be afraid* in its secondary

meaning – to express the phenomenon of understatement or an uncertain supposition (assumption). The main grammatical means of expression of a non-categorical statement is the forms of the Subjunctive Mood.

Person's self-confidence as well as his/her self-doubt becomes obvious through non-verbal, paralinguistic characteristics and is marked by the presence of the observer: *he was in doubt; she looked uncertain*. Assurance in somebody or uncertainty about something are labeled by the speaker himself: *I am sure, I hesitate; I am in doubt*.

#### Conclusion

A feeling of uncertainty, a sense of insecurity, is a reaction to a basic emotion – fear. Fear is a kind of defense reaction, a signal of a possible danger (threat). Uncertainty as person's inability to make a decision on his own, as a physical sensation of lack of energy becomes accessible to

the observer through the uncertain verbal or non-verbal (definite physiological symptoms) speaker's behaviour. A feeling of uncertainty/insecurity can also arise from a reaction to such basic emotions as surprise (fright) and shame as self-detestation (humiliation) – social fears of a personal nature. A feeling of certainty, in its turn, is a capability of a person to control negative emotions and to return to a stable emotional state.

Certainty and uncertainty phenomena are realized on all the levels of linguistic system, the means of their linguistic representation are respectively categorical and non-categorical statements which rest on a particular bulk of linguistic means of expression that are perfectly adapted to its realization and affect the addressee's behaviour with the help of resoluteness, confidence, assuredness and unpredictability or, on the contrary, hesitancy, courtesy and understatement.

#### Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

#### Conflict of Interest

None declared.

#### Список литературы / References

1. Bar-Anan Y. The Feeling of Uncertainty Intensifies Affective Reactions / Y. Bar-Anan, T. D. Wilson, and D.T. Gilbert // *Emotion*. – 2009. – Vol. 9 (1). – P. 123-127.
2. Blom P. A. *Wicked Company. The Forgotten Radicalism of the European Enlightenment* / P.A. Blom. – New York: Basic Books, 2010. – 384 p.
3. Cattell R. B. *The Scientific Analysis of Personality*. / R.B. Cattell. – New Brunswick, N.J.: Aldine Transaction, 2008. – 399 p.
4. Erikson E. H. *Childhood and Society* / E.H. Erikson. – London: Paladin Grafton Books, 1987. – 397 p.
5. Fromm E. *Greatness and Limitation of Freud's Thought* / E. Fromm. – London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1980. – 147 p.
6. Lakoff G. Classifiers as a Reflection of Mind / G.Lakoff // In *Noun classes and categorization. Proc. of a Symposium on Categorization and Noun Classification*, October 1983. – Eugene, Oregon: Benjamins. – 1986. – P. 13-51.
7. LeBuffe M. Paul-Henri Thiry (Baron) d'Holbach [Electronic resource] / M. LeBuffe // *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. – 2002. – URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/holbach/> (accessed: 10.12.2017).
8. Meili R. Grundlagen der individuellen Persönlichkeitsunterschiede Grundlagen individueller Persönlichkeitsunterschiede : Ergebnisse einer Längsschnittuntersuchung mit zwei Gruppen von der Geburt bis zum 8. und 16. Altersjahr / R. Meili. Bern: H. Huber, 1972. – 114 s.
9. Rosch E. Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories / E. Rosch // *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. – 1975. – Vol. 104 (3). – P. 192-233.
10. Taylor J. R. Linguistic Categorization. Prototypes in Linguistic Theory / J.P. Taylor. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. – 312 p.
11. Topka L. V. Situation of Uncertainty: pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic aspects of investigation / Larisa V. Topka // *European Scientific Journal. Republic of Macedonia: European Scientific Institute*. – 2013. – Vol. 9 (26). – P. 60-69.
12. Topka L.V. Certainty and uncertainty in terms of prototypical situation / Larisa V. Topka // *Selected Papers of the 11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics. Rhodes, 26-29 September 2013 (Workshop "The semantic field of emotions: interdisciplinary and cross-linguistic approaches: From word to phrase and text")*. – Rhodes: Laboratory of Linguistics of the Southeastern Mediterranean Department of Mediterranean Studies, University of the Aegean, Greece, 2014. – P. 1695-1704.
13. Wierzbicka A. German 'cultural scripts': public signs as a key to social attitudes and cultural values / A. Wierzbicka // *Discourse & Society*. – 1998. – Vol. 9(2). – P. 241-282.
14. Wierzbicka A. *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals* / A. Wierzbicka. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 349 p.
15. Wierzbicka A. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction* / A. Wierzbicka. – Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003. – 539 p.
16. Wittgenstein L. J. *Philosophical investigations* / L. J. Wittgenstein. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986. – 250 p.

#### Список литературы латинскими символами / References in English

1. Bar-Anan Y. The Feeling of Uncertainty Intensifies Affective Reactions / Y. Bar-Anan, T. D. Wilson, and D.T. Gilbert // *Emotion*. – 2009. – Vol. 9 (1). – P. 123-127.
2. Blom P. A. *Wicked Company. The Forgotten Radicalism of the European Enlightenment* / P.A. Blom. – New York: Basic Books, 2010. – 384 p.
3. Cattell R. B. *The Scientific Analysis of Personality*. / R.B. Cattell. – New Brunswick, N.J.: Aldine Transaction, 2008. – 399 p.
4. Erikson E. H. *Childhood and Society* / E.H. Erikson. – London: Paladin Grafton Books, 1987. – 397 p.

5. Fromm E. *Greatness and Limitation of Freud's Thought* / E. Fromm. – London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1980. – 147 p.
  6. Lakoff G. *Classifiers as a Reflection of Mind* / G.Lakoff // In *Noun classes and categorization. Proc. of a Symposium on Categorization and Noun Classification, October 1983.* – Eugene, Oregon: Benjamins. – 1986. – P. 13-51.
  7. LeBuffe M. *Paul-Henri Thiry (Baron) d'Holbach* [Electronic resource] / M. LeBuffe // *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* – 2002. – URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/holbach/> (accessed: 10.12.2017).
  8. Meili R. *Grundlagen der individuellen Persönlichkeitsunterschiede Grundlagen individueller Persönlichkeitsunterschiede : Ergebnisse einer Längsschnittuntersuchung mit zwei Gruppen von der Geburt bis zum 8. und 16. Altersjahr* [Basics of Personality Traits. Principles of individual personality differences: Results of a longitudinal study with two groups from birth to the ages of 8 and 16] / R. Meili. – Bern: H. Huber, 1972. – 114 p. [in German]
  9. Rosch E. *Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories* / E. Rosch // *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General.* – 1975. – Vol. 104 (3). – P. 192-233.
  10. Taylor J. R. *Linguistic Categorization. Prototypes in Linguistic Theory* / J.P. Taylor. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. – 312 p.
  11. Topka L. V. *Situation of Uncertainty: pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic aspects of investigation* / Larisa V. Topka // *European Scientific Journal. Republic of Macedonia: European Scientific Institute.* – 2013. – Vol. 9 (26). – P. 60-69.
  12. Topka L.V. *Certainty and uncertainty in terms of prototypical situation* / Larisa V. Topka // *Selected Papers of the 11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics. Rhodes, 26-29 September 2013 (Workshop "The semantic field of emotions: interdisciplinary and cross-linguistic approaches: From word to phrase and text").* – Rhodes: Laboratory of Linguistics of the Southeastern Mediterranean Department of Mediterranean Studies, University of the Aegean, Greece, 2014. – P. 1695-1704.
  13. Wierzbicka A. *German 'cultural scripts': public signs as a key to social attitudes and cultural values* / A. Wierzbicka // *Discourse & Society.* – 1998. –Vol. 9(2). – P. 241-282.
  14. Wierzbicka A. *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals* / A. Wierzbicka. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 349 p.
  15. Wierzbicka A. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction* / A. Wierzbicka. – Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003. – 539 p.
  16. Wittgenstein L. J. *Philosophical investigations* / L. J. Wittgenstein. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986. – 250 p.
-