METACOMMUNICATION IN THE CONTEXT OF SPEECH INFLUENCE OPTIMISATION

Sergiy Kryvoruchko, Yevhen Chervinko, Iuliia Shamaieva

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (Kharkiv, Ukraine)

kryvoruchko_sergiy@ukr.net

The present article focuses on studying metacommunication as a multi-dimensional self-reconfiguration endless symbolic process and its mechanisms of realising and optimising dynamic speech influence in German dialogue discourse within the anthropocentric framework of pragmalinguistics. Special emphasis has been laid on revealing the functional nature of metacommunication as phatic communication and as communication about communication, sustainably enhancing speech impact in a dialogue discourse environment. On the methodological basis of contextual, intentional, speech act and discursive implicature analyses the authors determine and define speech means that prove to be conducive to interlocutors' succeeding in speech acts as perlocutionary optimisers. The research material is represented by fragments of the dialogue discourse containing such tools of perlocutionary optimisation, collected by continuous sampling from German works of literature, where characters' speech is close to day-to-day conversational communication. The procedure of the given research comprised the analysis of discursive fragments in which the realisation of speech acts of various illocutionary types (potentially) results in communicative failures followed by studying metacommunicative utterances produced by the speaker to correct (or to prevent) the undesirable effects of his/her (potential) unsuccessful speech acts as perlocutionary optimisers. Realising the metacommunicative contactive speech act, they solve two blocks of tasks that contribute to the effective implementation of speech impact in the discourse: technically ensuring the uninterrupted flow of communication and additional intensifying the intended speech influence on the interlocutor, which is referred to as perlocutionary intensification. Based on this, the article offers a brief overview of the main technical tasks of perlocutionary optimisers, as well as a detailed analysis of the pragma-discursive features of perlocutionary intensifiers, namely: determining the way of their discursive realisation; distinguishing their pragmatic types depending on the object of influence; substantiating their position relative to other speech acts in verbal interaction, and describing the relevant situations of their functioning in the contemporary German dialogue discourse.

Keywords: metacommunication; speech influence optimisation; perlocutionary intensification; speech act; contactive speech act; contemporary German dialogue discourse.

Introduction

Nowadays media, technology and individuals who increasingly apply both novel and conventional communication tools to develop new forms of communication converge and are considered to be the key global discourse concepts in the twenty-first century (Eadie, 2009, p. xi). As a result, speech communication as a multifaceted interdisciplinary integrity makes part and parcel of social interaction and constitutes an essential building block of its organisation. The aims of the interlocutors go beyond the framework of conventional exchanges of speech messages and are directed at mutual management of joint activities (Issers, 2009, p. 33). In this respect, any speech communication, as it is stated in "Business communication for success" (2015), can be regarded as an impact on interlocutors' thoughts, actions and feelings by means of speech, being a process by which we assign meaning to linguistic signs and convey this meaning in an attempt to create shared understanding.

A correct understanding of the linguistic signs selected by the interlocutors during the progress of interaction underpins communication, however, does not guarantee the success of the speech impact: "knowledge of the linguistic system – the rules of the language – is only one of the prerequisites for verbal communication, and not always the most significant in the impact on consciousness" (Dem'yankov, 1984, p. 141). Thus, it is common practice to distinguish the communication per se – any process of producing signs by one interlocutor and the perception of these signs by the other interlocutor with the same understanding of these signs by both, and effective communication, in which the same understanding of signs is accompanied by the same convictions (Schaff, 1962, p. 354).

The effectiveness of speech communication is determined by the extent to which the aim and the result of the above influence coincide (Ermolaev, 1990, p. 46; Molina & Jennings, 2018) and can vary significantly depending on (non)-communicative circumstances. The latter constitute communicative situations (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2014), comprising the purpose of communicative exchange, its content domain, the identity of its participants, and the meaningful corresponding conditional congruent or non-congruent stimuli that surround the verbal communication. In this connection, what has become obvious is the actual necessity of revealing speech means capable of optimising speech impact to achieve its maximum effect – perlocutionary optimisers, which is underway in various disciplinary fields, specifically in pragmalinguistics (Bezugla, 2009; Kryvoruchko, 2011), emotiology, language ecology (Fill & Mühlhäusler, 2006), language

philosophy (Jensen, 2018; Slotta, 2015), semantics (Kissine, 2008), cognitive linguistics (Hart, 2010), linguocultural studies (Kang, 2013), semiotics (Gaspard, 2018), teaching foreign languages (Feng, 2016). Taking into consideration "an intrinsic process of orienting the comprehension" (Mateus, 2017, p. 85), with the relationship dimension standing along the content of communication, it is metacommunication that proves to be such a fundamental optimiser in communicational processes, "permanently overcoming the codified borders of communication, recommunicating communication itself" (Mateus, 2017, p. 86).

The **purpose of the article** is to study the concept of metacommunication, revealing its potential in terms of optimising speech impact, in particular: to analyse intentional and speech-act specifics of metacommunicative means as perlocutionary optimisers; to examine pragma-discursive features of perlocutionary intensifiers as the means of optimising speech impact: to define the way of their realisation, their pragmatic types, as well as situations of their functioning in the contemporary German dialogue discourse.

Brief overview

In the process of exerting speech impact, two blocks of tasks are to be singled out (Tarasov, 1983, p. 80) for clarity referred to as 'technical' and 'impact' ones. The former is connected with the organisation of interaction and involves creating optimal conditions for impact realisation. Here belong the following aspects: establishing contact, attracting and holding the attention of the audience, winning their trust, as well as creating psychological conditions conducive to better speech comprehension. The latter block concerns organising and realising speech impact per se, the ultimate task of which is to convey certain information to the audience, convince and urge them to take certain actions (Tarasov, 1983, p. 91-92).

Each of these blocks presupposes exploiting a special 'tool kit' to facilitate the accomplishment of its tasks, thus optimising the speech impact. Here belong a number of extralinguistic tools, such as the speed and loudness of speech, interlocutors' appearance and status symbols (Bogomolova, 1990; Tarasov, 1983, pp. 84–85), levels of their relationships ("well-wishing amiable attitude helps the subject of impact to win his/her object over, make him/her an ally, thus, facilitating success" (Kulikov, 1983, p. 165)). At the same time, there have been discovered a range of linguistic tools proper, including those for establishing speech contact (Pochepcov, 1981), creating necessary preconditions for an optimal perception of discourse fragments (Wierzbicka, 1971), aimed at either enhancing or softening speech impact (Holmes, 1984; Zeoli, 2008).

Our findings indicate that it is metacommunication that constitutes an essential linguistic instrument of speech impact optimisation, contributing to the accomplishment of the tasks of both blocks. It is mainly regarded as "a special type of communication, the subject of which is the process of communication" (Kashkin, Knyazeva, & Rubtsov, 2008, p. 110), "the message under the message" (Wubbolding, 2013, p. 168), dealing with cultural sensitivity, empathy, congruence (correspondence between input information and output felicity), emotional regard, interlocutors' (un)willingness to function within the boundaries of social, professional, personal guidelines, standards and ethics. For that matter, metacommunication is also characterised as a bridge between individuals as ethnosemantic entities and society as a whole (Bateson, 1972), the issue being that "speech optimisation processes are carried out by means of various language-related tools which enable communicating about means of communication and communications systems" (Hoppenbrouwers, Weigand, 2000, p. 131).

In fact, the interdisciplinary idea of every message having a metacommunicative component with metacommunicative functional information concerning how to interpret other messages roots back to 1951, when G. Bateson invented the term within the framework of his research project on communication, placing special emphasis on logical paradoxes (Ruesch & Bateson, 1951; Chan, Foy, & Magliano, 2018). Although the phenomenon of metacommunication has been the subject matter of many sciences, it is in linguistic studies (for instance, influenced by J. Derrida Communication Theory (Mateus, 2017) or theories of self-referentiality in mass media (Esser, Reinemann & Fan, 2001)) that its nature has been revealed more than once, primarily in its 'technical' function as means of ensuring the free flow of speech interaction (Misnevs & Demiray, 2017). However, the impacting potential of metacommunicative units hasn't been the key focus of scientists' attention yet. Therefore, consideration of this issue in terms of pragmalinguistics explicates the topical value of the present research.

Methods

The principles of cognitive pragmalinguistics and the theory of discourse, which is characterised by the unity of cognitive and communicative aspects, underpin the methodological basis of the present paper. To study the pragma-discursive properties of metacommunicative utterances in the function of perlocutionary optimisation in the contemporary Germanic dialogue discourse, we employed such methods as observation,

description, induction, deduction, introspection for sampling and analysis of linguistic material and presenting the findings of the research; contextual and intentional analysis to reveal the speaker's communicative intentions. Illocutionary types of utterances under consideration are determined with the help of speech act analysis. The peculiarities of implicit speech act realisation are studied through analysing and explicating discursive implicatures for establishing the peculiarities of implicit speech act realisation.

The research material comprises the corpus of 2021 fragments of the dialogue discourse containing metacommunicative means of perlocutionary optimisation, collected by continuous sampling from German works of literature, where characters' speech is close to day-to-day conversational communication.

The procedure for selecting discursive fragments is as follows: at the first stage of the study, we analysed discursive fragments in which the realisation of speech acts of various illocutionary types resulted in communicative failures due to malfunctioning of the 'technical' or 'impact' blocks of tasks that should ensure the effective realisation of speech impact: for instance, the listener's misunderstanding the communicative intentions of the speaker, disturbed balance of interpersonal relations between them, their reluctance to 'correspond' to the interlocutor's perlocutionary purposes by their behaviour, etc. We qualify metacommunicative utterances produced by the speaker to correct the undesirable effects of such unsuccessful speech acts as perlocutionary optimisers and, depending on their function, consider them to belong to the means of optimising the 'technical' or 'impact' block of tasks. The analysis of the samples has shown that in similar communicative situations they are characterised by a high degree of repeatability, otherwise stated, they are conventional in their optimising meaning. In this regard, such optimisers are used not only as the speaker's reaction to his/her communicative failure, but are also employed in advance to prevent the occurrence of unwanted adverse effects. Therefore, at the second stage of the study, we took into consideration discursive fragments with perlocutionary optimisers in the pre-position to the speech act, whose influence in the speaker's opinion required provisional optimisation, that is, suchlike situations, where communicative failures were prevented and did not necessarily take place.

Results and discussion

As it is known, metacommunication, as opposed to communication, doesn't convey information about the surrounding objects and phenomena. Instead, it describes the very communicative process, characterising the course of communication and representing the way its interaction dynamics is organised and managed by language means (Sinitsyna, 2005, p. 4). It is subject to the main communication, serving needs of the latter (Valsiner & Branco, 2006), and its role in the sociogenesis of the dialogical self can hardly be overestimated (Branco, 2005).

From the point of view of metacommunication functional intent, there prove to be at least two approaches to its understanding: as phatic communication and as communication about communication that inter alia "carries meaning to either enhance or weaken what we say in words" (Misnevs & Demiray, 2017, p. 214).

In phatic communication metacommunicative means are conducive to a successful flow of communication due to organising the work of communication channels they are aimed at, ensuring switching the addressee's attention to the message, maintaining the addressee's attention at the proper level while the message is conveyed and disconnecting the speech contact, thus opening, maintaining and closing speech interaction (Pochepcov, 1981, p. 52). Phatic metacommunication is highly ritualised, conventional, dominated by social and regulatory information and realised through phatic speech acts – speech stereotypes that constitute various interjectional attention-attracters, appeals, parenthetic clauses of catching attention and introducing new topics into the conversation, echo-questions, maintaining attention, etc. (Matyukhina, 2004, p. 10): *Schau mal!; Stell dir vor!; Hör zu!; Hör mal, was ich dir sage!; Weißt du was; Hörst du?; Und? Echt? Hm; Na ja* etc.:

> *„Hört zu, ihr zwei, ich möchte euch etwas sagen. Euch kann hier nichts passieren. Ich werde euch beschützen, das verspreche ich." (Benedikt, 2015, p. 40)*

The other approach to understanding metacommunication views it as ensuring an effective course of communication, contributing to an adequate perception of information, focusing on how a message is delivered and is meant to be interpreted (Parker, 2014; Rosenberg, 2018). It eliminates comprehension interferences related to the meaning in the process of communication, reflects the coded content of messages and contributes to their correct understanding, establishing logical connections, directing the flow of interaction, expressing the speaker's attitude to the content of his/her utterance (Wierzbicka, 1971; Devkin, 1981). Speech acts, realising the purposes mentioned, comprise "description", "correction", "specifying", "estimation", "comments" etc. (Meyer-Hermann, 1976): *Damit ist Folgendes gemeint, ...; Ich wollte nur sagen, ...; Das heißt,...; Daraus folgt, ...; anders / genauer / richtiger gesagt, ...* etc:

Der Kellner erklärte, Lissabon sei keine Stadt für viel Nachtleben. Als Schwarz ihm ein Trinkgeld gab, wußte er ein Lokal, ein geheimes, sagte er, einen russischen Nachtklub. „Sehr elegant", erklärte er.
„Wird man uns hineinlassen?" fragte ich.
„Natürlich, mein Herr. <u>Ich wollte nur sagen,</u> daß es elegante Frauen dort gibt. Alle Nationen. Deutsche auch." (Remarque, 1966, p. 32)

Commenting on the process of speech interaction, metacommunication inter alia regulates the balance of interlocutors' relations (communicative balance), thus promoting the maintenance of speech acts. The so-called *Beziehungsakte* (Germ. for "interpersonal acts") are aimed at relieving tension and improving communication partners' relations (Schwitalla, 1979, p. 138). These tasks are accomplished among others through perlocutionary mitigators – speech means aimed at mitigating non-intended speech impact with a view to preventing or softening undesired perlocutionary consequences. As a rule, the latter are represented by the addressee's negative emotional reaction to various threats to his/her dignity referred to as "face" by P. Brown and S. Levinson (1987), and are potentially conflictogenic (for further information about perlocutionary mitigation see (Kryvoruchko, 2016)):

„Verzeihen Sie <...> Haben Sie Ihre Frau schon mal betrogen?"
Heinrich Emanuel stand auf. <u>Er war beleidigt.</u> „Ich bitte Sie, Herr Stabsarzt!" (Konsalik, 1976, p. 80)

The (partial) neutralisation of the above-mentioned threats is achieved by means of mitigating the illocutionary force of the corresponding speech acts by way of mitigating utterances, which realise the metacommunicative contactive speech act in compliance with standards of critical discourse study (Stibbe, 2014). Employing them, the speaker explains, describes his/her other speech acts, which s/he has performed or intends to perform, drawing the addressee's attention to his/her words and placing particular emphasis on certain content entities (Bezugla, 2009, p. 59). Here we also deal with illocutionary and perlocutionary content of speech acts – preconditions, conditions, aims and consequences of their realisation (Schwitalla, 1979, p. 113).

Leo: Die Zeit hat andere Längen heute. Denken Sie an die Zinsgeschäfte.
Papa: Ja, ja.
Leo: Sie sind nicht mit der Zeit gegangen. Das rächt sich jetzt. Die Automatik.
Papa: Naher kann jeder gescheit daherredn! Da kann man sich nix kaufn dafür. Diese Jugend mit ihrer Intelligenz gegen das Alter.
Leo: <u>Ich wollte Ihnen nicht nahe treten.</u> <u>Der Rat war sozusagen geschäftlich.</u> (Krötz, 1972, p. 437)

Thus, ensuring a steady functional performance of connection channels, an adequate perception of produced utterances and maintaining an interpersonal balance in communication, metacommunication optimises speech impact, facilitating the accomplishment of the tasks of the 'technical' block. The created conditions, in their turn, allow for a more efficient realisation of speech impact, however, by far not always ensuring its success.

The 'impact' block also requires optimisation – employing special means capable of enhancing speech impact on the addressee – perlocutionary intensifiers (Kryvoruchko, 2011). As opposed to mitigators as "one of the most significant pragmatic categories among all the discourse markers" (Qianbo, 2016, p. 74), they modify the intended speech impact, intensify it, thus exerting additional pressure on the addressee's mental and emotional domains.

Notably, it is enough for the 'technical' block to work properly so that the speech impact is realised efficiently in casual day-to-day communication. The necessity to employ perlocutionary intensifiers arises in situations of the (potential) perlocutionary failure – the addressee's (potential) resistance to the impact made by the speaker: when the addressee won't believe that the state of affairs communicated to him is true or won't carry out actions required or expected from him, or simply doesn't wish to experience the feelings verbally and non-verbally modelled for him to experience (Kryvoruchko, 2011; Shamaieva, 2014):

Herr Jänecke macht eine Pause. „Wir haben ihn entlassen müssen. Ihren Freund Heilbutt. Er hat da sehr hässliche Geschichten gemacht."
„Wieso?" sagt Pinneberg hitzig. „<u>Das glaube ich nicht!</u>" (Fallada, 1958, p. 302)

The function of perlocutionary intensification may be performed by phonetic, lexical and grammatical means, as well as by metacommunicative functionally-determined utterances (Weizman & Fetzer, 2015, p. 111). Just like mitigators, they realise the metacommunicative contactive speech act and clarify the illocutionary and perlocutionary content of the speaker's other speech acts by explicating their

perlocutionary purposes and felicity conditions for their realisation, singled out by J. Searle (1969). For example:

1. Normal input and output conditions: they mean that the speaker and hearer both know how to speak the language; both are conscious of what they are doing; they have no physical impediments to communication; and they are not playing in a play or telling jokes, etc.:

„Ich weiß nicht", sagte Kern, „ich möchte eins davon haben und es verkaufen, damit wir was zu leben haben."
„Sie sind ein Idealist", erwiderte Marill.
Kern sah ihn mißtrauisch an. „<u>Ich meine das ernst</u>", sagte Marill. (Remarque, 1991, p. 354)

2. Sincerity conditions: they mean that the speech act is being performed sincerely, i.e. the speaker honestly believes, feels, desires or intends to do what s/he is saying:

Ostra schüttelte den Kopf. „Seien Sie vernünftig, Fallers. In ein paar Tagen haben Sie Julia gesund und unversehrt wieder, wenn Sie schweigen."
„Ich bringe Sie um!" sagte Fallers dumpf. „Ja, ich bringe Sie um."
„<...>Aber ich verspreche Ihnen: Sie können zu Weihnachten Julia heiraten. <u>Mein Ehrenwort</u>." (Konsalik, 1975, p. 228)

3. Essential conditions: they determine the intentional specifics of illocution, i.e. the speaker's illocutionary purpose, thus determining the type of illocutionary acts:

Marie: Wenn der die Beziehungen von seinem Papa spielen läßt, dann kannst dich aufhängen. Herr Inspektorenanwärter.
Leo: Vielleicht.
Marie: <u>Unter Garantie</u>. (Kroetz, 1972, p. 463)

The intensifying function of metacommunicative contactives is assigned to them, as a rule, conventionally, as a result of which they can be employed in discourse both as in post- and pre-position to the main speech act – a speech act, the influence of which one has to enhance. In the former case they are the speaker's response to the perlocutionary failure of the speech impact exerted earlier and are directed at the correction of its perlocutionary effect:

„Was hat er Ihnen erzählt über seinen Einsatz?"
„Nichts."
„Irene, Sie kennen mich." Borokin lächelte mokant. „Man kann mich mit dem nichtssagenden Wort Nichts nicht abspeisen. Sie sollten sich solche Dummheiten endlich abgewöhnen. <...> Was hat Ihnen Wolfgang über seinen Einsatz an der Zonengrenze erzählt?"
„<u>Ich schwöre Ihnen</u> – nichts!" (Konsalik 1986, Begegnung in Tiflis, p. 202)

Their usage in pre-position is relevant in cases when the speaker is not sure of the success of his/her speech impact and strives to intensify it in advance:

„<...> Herr Doktor, <u>ich schwöre Ihnen bei allen Heiligen</u>, das war die schlimmste Zeit von meinem Leben! Furchtbar, furchtbar, was die Piefkes unserem kleinen, wehrlosen Land angetan haben! <...><u>Ich schwör's Ihnen</u>, Herr Doktor: Mein Großvater und mein Vater sind Rote gewesen und haben leiden müssen dafür. Und ich, ich war auch schon immer rot." (Simmel, 1980, p. 164)

It should be noted that perlocutionary intensifiers, directed at "upgrading the strength of the speaker's attempt to achieve the perlocutionary goal" (Napoli & Ravetto, 2017, p. 237), may be located not only in the pre-position to the main speech act but also in post-positions within the same move, i.e. prior to the addressee's response. Such a position can be explained by various stages in the formation of the speaker's intention of intensifying speech impacts (Aijun, 2015): at the pre-locutionary stage – prior to making an impact, when the intention of the perlocutionary intensification is shaped as a single unit with the intention of the main speech act, or at the post-locutionary stage – after its realisation when they are formed consecutively. In the latter case the speaker's awareness of the need to intensify speech impact may occur subject to the influence of the addressee's non-verbal behaviour that indicates a potential perlocutionary failure prior to its verbalisation in discourse:

„Sie verheimlichen mir etwas, Herr Stabsarzt. Seien Sie ehrlich ...haben Sie den Fuß amputiert?"
„Zwei Zehen. <u>Ich schwöre es Ihnen</u>. <...>" (Konsalik, 1976, p. 317)

Depending upon the way of expressing the metacommunicative component as a constituent of the proposition, metacommunicative contactives can be subdivided into the following two types: explicit and implicit ones. In the former case, the metacommunicative meaning contained in the proposition is explicitly expressed. Markers of explicit metacommunicative meaning are represented in various combinations by means of lexemes of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary semantics, pronominal adverbs and demonstrative pronouns such as *das / es*, correlating in terms of content with the interlocutors' preceding or forthcoming speech acts: *Das verspreche ich; Das versichere ich dir; Ich garantiere dafür; Ich verstehe, was ich sage:*

„Ambrosius ist nicht Euer Onkel." Der Stadtvogt spie die Worte förmlich aus, das Gesicht vor Wut gerötet.
Constanzes Ton wurde nun ruhiger, beinahe sanft, und sie lächelte. „Er ist mein Taufpate, Herr Vogt, und mir herzlich verbunden, seitdem meine Mutter mir das Leben schenkte. Schwört meinen Unmut herauf, und Ihr werdet auch seinen Einfluss zu spüren bekommen, das versichere ich Euch." (Benedikt, 2015, p. 24)

Implicit metacommunicative contactives are to be observed when metacommunicative content is expressed implicitly, i.e. not verbalised and has to be inferred. They may be conventionalised or implicative.

Speech acts of the first type do not comprise the above-mentioned metacommunicative constituent due to the shortened structure of the utterance and it is reconstrued extracontextually due to the usage sustainability of such forms. In this case we deal with elliptical constructs in which the metacommunicative component is omitted: *Ehrlich +> Ich sage / meine das ehrlich; Im Ernst +> Ich sage / meine das im Ernst; Absolut sicher +> Ich bin mir dessen absolut sicher:*

„Wo ist Loretta?" fragte Dr. Volkmar.
„Ich weiß es nicht. Ehrlich ... auch wenn Sie mich anblicken wie ein Amokläufer. Ich weiß es wirklich nicht. <...>" (Konsalik, 1978, p. 296)

To infer implicit metacommunicative content of implicative contactives as a representation of functional pragmalinguistic hybridity (Miller & Bayley, 2017), we should proceed from discursive context which is of the utmost importance in this respect. This context enables us to determine whether a given utterance is a comment on a speech act or whether it describes interlocutors' non-verbal behaviour: *Ich bin nicht verrückt / Ich bin nicht betrunken +> Ich verstehe / weiß / bin mir bewusst, was ich sage:*

„Und es blieb Ihnen nichts anders übrig, als einen Menschen zu töten?
„So ist es, Herr Kaplan." Lindhout lächelte wieder.
„Sind Sie..."
„Vollkommen!"
„Ich meine: Sind Sie sehr betrunken?"
„Ach so", sagte Lindhout. „Nein, sehr ganz bestimmt nicht, nur ein wenig. Ich weiß genau, was ich sage. Tut mir leid. Ich dachte, Sie wollten fragen, ob ich normal bin. Das bin ich. Wirklich. Vollkommen. Ich mußte diesen Mann töten." (Simmel, 1980, p. 631)

As is seen from the above examples, perlocutionary intensifiers contribute to the felicitous realisation of the impact of speech acts of various illocutionary types, singled out by Searle (1976). It is known that every illocutionary act is conventionally associated with a certain perlocutionary act – an act of impact (Cohen, 1973). Depending upon the purpose of the impact, the perlocutionary acts are divided into epistemic acts (urging the addressee to believe in a certain state of affairs), characteristic of representatives and commissives; volitional acts (urging the addressee to perform certain actions), characteristic of directives; and emotive acts (urging the addressee to experience certain feelings), characteristic of expressives (Kryvoruchko, 2011; compare with Staffeldt, 2007, pp. 133–135, 172). Proceeding from this, it is possible to identify the pragmatic types of perlocutionary intensifiers in terms of the direction of speech influence (conventionally: thoughts, actions, feelings). Thus, the perlocutionary intensifiers accompanying the realisation of epistemic, volitional and emotive perlocutionary acts are divided according to the object of influence into:

1. Epistemic, enhancing the speech impact on the addressee's thoughts:

„Wer war der Mann?" fragte Brahms ungerührt.
„Er mietete mein ganzes Boot, Herr. Er hatte drei schwer bewaffnete Wächter bei sich. Er war kein Ägypter. Er sah wie ein Araber aus. Wie ein reicher Scheich. Er betäubte die blonde Frau, und die drei

Wächter trugen sie an Land. <u>Das ist die Wahrheit, Herr. Ich schwöre es bei dem Propheten!</u>"
(Konsalik, 1986, Nächte am Nil, p. 193)

2. Volitional, enhancing the speech impact on the addressee's actions:

Hagedorn machte eine steife Verbeugung. „Herr Geheimrat, unter diesen Umständen möchte ich Sie bitten..."
Tobler sagte: „Fritz, sprich jetzt nicht weiter! <u>Ich bitte dich darum</u>. Rede jetzt keinen Unsinn, ja? <u>Ich verbiete es dir</u>! Komm, gib dem ollen Tobler die Hand!"
<...> Fritz ergriff die dargebotene Hand. (Kästner, 1969, p. 168)

3. Emotive, enhancing the speech impact on the addressee's feelings:

„<...> Der Test ist befriedigend verlaufen. Das Resultat im Juni wird das gleiche sein." Mirko nickte.
„Ich muss Ihnen meine Bewunderung aussprechen", sagte er. „<u>Ganz ehrlich</u>, Jana. Ich bewundere Sie." (Schätzing, 2006, p. 132)

The results of our research prove that perlocutionary intensifiers of the metacommunicative type may enhance a successful realisation of speech impacts of all the illocutionary types of speech acts. The only exception to this is declaratives that, their institutional character taken into consideration, do not typically tend to require any additional perlocutionary modification. It should also be noted that the variety of forms of metacommunicative contactives depends on the illocutionary and perlocutionary specifics of speech acts, their distinct felicity conditions, the content of which is explicated in discourse for the purpose of perlocutionary intensification.

Conclusions

To sum up, speech communication constitutes a process of exerting impact using speech to achieve (non-) communicative goals. Its felicity rests on the quality of the performance of the two blocks of tasks: creating optimal communicative conditions for realising an impact ('technical' block), and realising the impact per se ('impact' block).

The means conducive to their effective solution act as optimisers of speech communication overall and the impact in particular, or as perlocutionary optimisers. These include, inter alia, metacommunication, which serves the communicative process, is its inalienable dimension and ensures its smooth uninterrupted flow, sustainability and felicity. It has a wide range of optimisation capabilities, contributing to the realisation of both the 'technical' and 'impact' block of tasks.

In order to optimise the 'technical' block, metacommunicative utterances contribute to the organisation of the speech contact, the adequate perception of information and regulate the balance of interpersonal relations. The 'impact' block is optimised due to the intensification of speech influence on the addressee – perlocutionary intensification.

Perlocutionary optimisers of the metacommunicative type are realised in the discourse, as a rule, as a kind of phatic speech act — a metacommunicative contactive. It is aimed at optimising the speech contact with the addressee by commenting on the verbal interaction. On the basis of the availability of verbalised metacommunicative meaning in the proposition, explicit and implicit metacommunicative contactives are to be distinguished. Implicit metacommunicative contactives may be conventionalised or implicative.

Perlocutionary intensification by means of metacommunicative contactives is achieved by explicating the felicity conditions of speech acts, as well as verbalisation of their perlocutionary purposes and is relevant in situations of (potential) perlocutionary failure — the addressee's reluctance to 'correspond' to the speaker's perlocutionary purposes by his/her behaviour: when the addressee does not want to believe in a certain state of affairs, to perform some actions or experience some feelings.

Perlocutionary intensifiers accompany speech acts of various illocutionary types, contributing to the realisation of their speech impact. Depending on the object of influence (thoughts, actions or feelings), intensifiers are divided into pragmatic types: epistemic — increasing the impact of assertives and commissives, volitional — increasing the impact of directives, emotive — enhancing the effect of expressives. Perlocutionary intensification of declaratives has not been established due to their institutional nature.

Thus, the prospects of our further research include a more detailed in-depth analysis of the existing metacommunication tools and revealing new instruments of metacommunication to intensify speech impact in German dialogue discourse within the framework of pragmalinguistics, socio-pragmatics, cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology with both synchronic and diachronic dimensions taken into account.

References:

Aijun, L. (2015). *Encoding and decoding of emotional speech: a cross-cultural and multimodal study between Chinese and Japanese*. New York: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-47691-8

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution and epistemology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Benedikt, C. (2015). *Die Feinde der Tuchhändlerin [The enemies of the cloth merchant]*. München: Droemer Knaur GmbH & Co. KG.

Bezugla, L.R. (2009). *Perlokutyvni indykatory implicytnogo smyslu u vyslovlennjah nimec'koi' movy.* [Perlocutionary markers of implicit meaning in German utterances]. *Visnyk KhNU imeni V.N. Karazina*, *848*, 58-62. Retrieved from http://dspace.univer.kharkov.ua/handle/123456789/6417.

Bogomolova, N.N. (1990). Otnoshenie auditorii k kommunikatoru kak faktor effektivnosti kommunikativnogo vozdejstvija [The attitude of the audience to the speaker as a factor of communicative impact effectiveness]. In N. N. Bogomolova & O. T. Mel'nikova (Eds), *Optimizacija rechevogo vozdejstvija [Speech influence optimisation]* (pp. 100-113). Moscow: Nauka.

Branco, A.U. (2005). Peer interactions, language development and metacommunication. *Culture & psychology, 11, 4*, 415-429. DOI: 10.1177/1354067x05058580

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language use*. NY: Doubleday. DOI:10.1017/cbo9780511813085

Business communication for success. (2015). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing.

Chan, G., Foy, J., & Magliano, J. (2018). Factors that affect crossover between multiple worlds within a narrative. *Discourse processes, 55 (8)*, 666-685. DOI:10.1080/0163853x.2017.1323540

Cohen, T. (1973). Illocutions und Perlocutions. *Foundations of language, 9*, 492-503. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-47691-8_6

Dem'jankov, V.Z. (1984). Kommunikativnoe vozdejstvie na strukturu soznanija [Communicative influence on the consciousness structure]. *Rol' jazyka v strukturirovanii soznanija, 1*, 138-161.

Devkin, V.D. (1981). *Dialog: Nemeckaja razgovornaja rech' v sopostavlenii s russkoj* [Dialogue: German and Russian colloquial speech contrasted]. Moscow: Vysshaja shkola.

Eadie, W.F. (Ed.). (2009). *21st century communication. A reference book*. Los Angeles: SAGE. DOI: 10.4135/9781412964005

Ermolaev, B.A. (1990). Celeobrazovanie v kommunikacii [Purpose-formation in communication]. In B. A. Ermolaev, *Optimizacija rechevogo vozdejstvija [Speech influence optimisation]* (pp. 46-55). Moscow: Nauka.

Esser, F., Reinemann, C., & Fan, D. (2001). Spin doctors in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany. Metacommunication about media manipulation. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 6 (1)*, 16-45. DOI:10.1177/108118001129171982

Fallada, H. (1958). *Kleiner Mann – was nun?* [Little man - what now?]. Hamburg: Blüchert Verlag, Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH.

Feng, Y. (2016). Teaching speech acts in EFL classroom: an implicit pedagogy. *Sino-US English teaching, 13 (7)*, 515-520. DOI: 10.17265/1539-8072/2016.07.002

Fill, A., & Mühlhäusler, P. (Eds.). (2006). *The ecolinguistics reader. Language, ecology and environment*. NY: Continuum.

Gaspard, J. (2018). Toward a Peircean approach to perlocution. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 51 (2)*, 105-123. DOI: 10.5325/philrhet.51.2.0105

Hart, C. (2010). Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on immigration discourse. NY: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230299009_7

Holmes, J. (1984). Modifying illocutionary force. *Journal of Pragmatics, 8*, 345-365. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(84)90028-6

Hoppenbrouwers, S., & Weigand H. (2000). Meta-communication in the language action perspective. In M. Schoop, C. Quix (Eds.), *Proc. of the Fifth International Workshop on the Language-Action Perspective on Communication Modelling (LAP 2000)* (pp. 131-149), Germany, Sept. 14-16. Aachen: RWTH Aachen.

Issers, O.S. (2009). *Rechevoe vozdejstvie* [Speech influence]. Moscow: Flinta : Nauka.

Jensen, K.B. (2018). The double hermeneutics of communication research. *Javnost-the Public, 25 (1-2)*, 177-183. DOI: 10.1080/13183222.2018.1418968

Kang, Q. (2013). On perlocutionary act. In Alvin Linden&Si Liu (Ed.), *Studies in Literature and Language, 6 (1)*, 60-64. DOI:10.3968/j.sll.1923156320130601.1582

Kashkin, V.B., Knyazeva, D.S., & Rubtsov, S.S. (2008). Metakommunikacija perevodchika v primechanijah i kommentarijah. [Metacommunicating in interpreter's footnotes and commentaries]. *Jazyk, kommunikacija i social'naja sreda, 6*, 110-119.

Kästner E. (1969). *Drei Männer im Schnee* [Three men in the snow]. Zürich: Droemer Knaur Verlag.

Kissine, M. (2008). Teaching and learning guide for: Locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 2/6*, 1189-1202. DOI: 10.1111/j.1749-818x.2008.00093.x

Konsalik, H.G. (1975). *Schlüsselspiele für drei Paare* [Key plays for three couples]. Köln: Lingen Verlag GmbH.

Konsalik, H.G. (1976). *Manöver im Herbst* [Maneuver in the fall]. Bayreuth: Hestia-Verlag GmbH.

Konsalik, H.G. (1978). *Das Haus der verlorenen Herzen* [The house of the lost hearts]. München: Bertelsmann Verlag GmbH.

Konsalik, H.G. (1986). *Begegnung in Tiflis* [Meeting in Tbilisi]. Bayreuth: Hestia-Verlag GmbH.

Konsalik, H.G. (1986). *Nächte am Nil* [Nights at the Nile]. Bayreuth: Hestia-Verlag GmbH.

Kroetz, F.X. (1972). *Gesammelte Stücke* [Collected pieces]. Fr./M.: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Kryvoruchko, S.I. (2011). *Lingvopragmatychni vlastyvosti perlokutyvnyh optymizatoriv u suchasnomu nimets'komovnomu dyskursi* [Linguistic and pragmatic properties of perlocutionary optimizers in modern German discourse]. PhD thesis, Kharkiv. Retrieved from: http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua

Kryvoruchko, S.I. (2016). *Strategija perlokutivnoj mitigacii kak sposob optimizacii rechevogo vozdejstvija* [Strategy of perlocutionary mitigation as the means of optimising speech influence]. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology, IV(25), 105*, 68-72. Retrieved February 27, 2018, from http://seanewdim.com/uploads/3/4/5/1/34511564/kryvoruchko_s._strategy_of_perlocutionary_mitigation_as_the_means_of_optimizing_speech_influence.pdf

Kulikov, V.N. (1983). *Prikladnoe issledovanie social'no-psihologicheskogo vozdejstvija.* [The applied research of social-psychological impact]. In Ye. V. Shorohova, V. P. Levkovich (Eds.), *Prikladnye problemy social'noj psihologii* (pp. 158-172). Moscow: Nauka.

Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2014). Metacommunication. *Key Concepts in Intercultural Dialogue, 25*. Retrieved February 27, 2018, from http://www.centerforinterculturaldialogue.org

Mateus, S. (2017). Metacommunication as second order communication. *KOME – An International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry, 5 (1),* 80-90. DOI: 10.17646/kome.2017.15

Matyukhina, Y.V. (2004*). Rozvytok systemy fatychnoi' metakomunikacii' v anglijs'komu dyskursi XVI-XX st.* [The Development of the Phatic Metacommunication System in the English Discourse of the 16th- 20th cc.]. PhD thesis, Kharkiv. Retrieved from: http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua

Meyer-Hermann, R. (1976). Metakommunikation. *LuD, 25,* 83-86.

Miller, D.R., & Bayley, P. (Eds.) (2017). *Hybridity in systemic functional linguistics: grammar, text and discursive context.* Bristol: Equinox.

Misnevs, B., & Demiray, U. (2017). The role of communication and meta-communication in software engineering with relation to human errors. In I. Kabashkin, I. Yatskiv (Jackiva), O. Prentkovskis (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Reliability and Statistics in Transportation and Communication* (pp. 213-222). Riga, Latvia: Elsevier. DOI: 10.1016/j.proeng.2017.01.100

Molina, R.G., & Jennings, F.G. (2018). The role of civility and metacommunication in Facebook discussions. *Communication studies., 68 (1),* 42-66. DOI: 10.1080/10510974.2017.1397038

Napoli, M., & Ravetto, M. (Eds.). (2017). *Exploring intensification: synchronic, diachronic and cross-linguistic perspectives.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.189

Parker J. (2014). Meta-communication: what a skill! *Jeff Parker MSW & Associates Inc.* Retrieved March 2, 2018, from jeffpacker.com

Pochepcov, G.G. (1981). Faticheskaja metakommunikacija [Phatic metacommunication]. *Semantika i pragmatika sintaksicheskih edinstv,* 52-59.

Qianbo, L. (2016). Mitigating mechanism of discourse markers. *Canadian Social Science, 12 (12),* 74-78. DOI:10.3968/9033

Remarque, E.M. (1966). *Die Nacht von Lissabon* [The Night of Lisbon]. Stuttgart: Verlag: Deutscher Bücherbund GmbH.

Remarque, E.M. (1991). *Liebe deinen Nächsten* [Love your nearest]. Köln: Verlag: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Rosenberg, A. (2018). Taking apart structural change. The constitutive role of communication in relieving tensions. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 26 (2),* 368-381. DOI: 10.1108/ijoa-04-2017-1156

Ruesch, J., & Bateson, G. (1951). *The social matrix of psychiatry.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Schaff, A. (1962). *Introduction to semantics* [Wstep do semantyki] (O. Wojtasiewicz, Trans.). Oxford/Warszawa: Pergamon Press.

Schätzing, F. (2006). *Lautlos.* München: Goldmann Verlag.

Schwitalla, J. (1979). Metakommunikation als Mittel der Dialogorganisation und der Beziehungsdefinition. *Arbeiten zur Konversationsanalyse.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 111-143. DOI: 10.1515/9783111346007.111

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/cbo9781139173438

Searle, J.R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in society, 5(1),* 1–23. DOI: 10.1017/s0047404500006837

Shamaieva, Iu.Iu. (2014). Fractal semiotics of the language of emotions: a cognitive linguistics dimension. In K. S. Thomars & R. K. Deo (Eds), *International Journal of Advancements in Research & Technology, 3 (11),* 169-172. Retrieved from: http://www.ijoart.org/docs/Fractal-Semiotics-of-the-Language-of-Emotions-a-Cognitive-Linguistics-Dimension.pdf

Simmel, J. (1980). *Wir heißen euch hoffen* [We are calling upon you to hope]. Ascona, München: Droemer Knaur Verlag.

Sinicyna, A.N. (2005). *Metakommunikativnyie edinitsyi i ih rol v organizatsii i regulyatsii angloyazyichnogo dialogicheskogo obscheniya.* [Metacommunication units and their role in the organisation and regulation of English-speaking dialogic communication]. PhD thesis, Saint Petersburg. Retrieved from: https://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01002942906#?page=1

Slotta, J. (2015). The perlocutionary is political: listening as self-determination in a Papua New Guinean polity. *Language in society, 44* (4), 525-552. DOI: 10.1017/s0047404515000421

Staffeldt, S. (2007). *Perlokutionäre Kräfte. Lexikalisierte Wirkungen sprachlicher Äußerungen im Deutschen* [Perlocutionary forces. Lexicalized effects of linguistic utterances in German]. Fr./M.: Peter Lang GmbH.

Stibbe, A. (2014). An ecolinguistic approach to critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies, 11, 1,* 117-128. DOI: 10.1080/17405904.2013.845789

Tarasov, E.F. (1983). *Rechevoe vozdejstvie: dostizhenija i perspektivy issledovanija* [Speech impact: achievements and research prospects]. In E. Tarasov (Ed.), *Jazyk kak sredstvo ideologicheskogo vozdejstvija* [Language as a means of ideological impact] (pp. 76-95). Moscow: Nauka.

Valsiner, J., & Branco, A.U. (2006). *Communication and metacommunication in human development.* Greenwich: IAP.

Weizman, E., & Fetzer, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Follow-ups in political discourse: explorations across contexts and discourse domains.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: 10.1075/dapsac.60

Wierzbicka, A. (1971). Metatekst w tekscie. In M. R. Mayenowa (Ed.), *O spójnościitekstu* (pp. 105-121). Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: ZNiO Wydawnictwo PAN.

Wubbolding, R.E. (2013*). Reality therapy for the 21st century.* London: Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203768457

Zeoli, R. (2008). *The 7 principles of public speaking. Proven methods from a PR professional.* NY: Skyhorse Publishing.