

WORLD CREATING PREDICATES IN THE POSSIBLE WORLD OF HORROR DISCOURSE

Reference has always been the object of scientific interest of humanitarian disciplines that allowed their mutual influence and enrichment. Discursive approach which dominates in modern linguistics (P. Strawson, J. Searle, S. Kripke, K. Hintikka and others) gives scientists an opportunity to concentrate on the reference within the boundaries of a text (oral or written) rather than that a sentence. Among the problematic aspects that move forward the pragmatic view on reference is the one that this research is aimed at: the analysis of reference in “possible worlds” of horror discourse. Admitting subjectivity as the basic principle of pragmatic researches allows concentrating on the object of reference that exists as the result of subjective processing; correspondingly, fictional reality exists as the result of human conceptualization of the possible world. The study bases on English and Ukrainian texts of horror discourse that adds objectivity to the results.

Modern pragmatic approach to the study of reference shows a variety of attitudes and terms used in these investigations. For example, O.O.Selivanova says that “subjective correlation of reality with all sides of the discourse fits the idea of imitated reference of the text, its likeness to a model or conversion, hypothetical nature, so-called pseudo-reference or sham-reference that was repeatedly expressed by linguists and logicians” [7, p.226], other scientists use terms like “fictional referents” (E.E.Brazgovskaya), “transcendental, or hypothetical” (N.D.Arutiunova). On the other hand, the scientists unanimously agree that a non-existing object referred to exists as long as it becomes the object of the utterance, “reference to hypothetical objects embodies what does

not exists in the real existential form: fictional objects are introduced into the so-called “possible worlds” [4, p.89-90].

The possible world of horror discourse has the highest degree of subjectivity that relies upon psychological grounds of the phenomenon of fear and cultural-historical and social background of the addresser and the addressee. We differentiate between the subject-recipient of horror and the subject-source of horror. Also, we consider it fundamental that a text starts exemplifying the possible world of horror discourse only after the subjects' conflict. In this counteraction the source of horror performs the leading role and is defined as an unreal person or non-person (a group of them) that is perceived as frightening due to its appearance, behavior, intentions, etc.; it is viewed as threatening to the recipient's self-identification, well-being, health or life; it is an active subject that acts with the intention to harm the recipient. The present analysis concentrates on one aspect of the definition given – the subject-source of horror is active and his behavior and intentions are frightening. Thus, we come closer to the role of predicates in the process of creating possible worlds.

World creating predicates perform the function of reference that is considered truthful only within the measures of alternative worlds. Objects of reference that belong to these worlds are referred to, in this case, indefinitely or opaquely resulting in the referential impression about the object of reference, still not identifying it (F.Rastier). This idea was supported by Yu.S.Stepanov who stated that predicates refer to the relations between things rather than things themselves; they are special signs to define relations which make it possible to actualize the changing state of the diverse world [8, p.127]. This theoretical background allows hypothesizing that in the possible world of horror discourse a subject is identified as a source of horror by means of reference made by predicates that denote active purposeful harmful intentions of this subject. Another important hypothesis is that these predicates are world creating as far as the text is built on the action and counteraction of subjects.

The world creating predicates can be classified in several ways, and the first is the division between preliminary reference and in-the-course reference. Preliminary reference is performed when the subject is not marked as the source of horror but is perceived as strange and weird or contrary to reality; naturally, it happens at the initial stage of the text development. For example, ***The queerest thing of all was, that although there was such a crowd of persons, and although fresh faces were pouring in every moment, there was no telling where they came from; they seemed to start up, in some strange manner, from the ground or the air and disappear in the same way*** [9, p.85]; ***Воно стояло на місці, витріщивши свої шкляні очі й мерзенні ікли на мене*** [1, 337]. As it is seen from the examples, the situational actualization of fear bases on the unconscious perception of the subject that either frightens or causes confusion of the recipient.

In-the-course reference is performed after the subject is classed as the source of horror and the main pragmatic function of this type of reference is to support the frightening atmosphere in the process of text development that bases on the actions and counteractions of subjects (consider the relations in English: *Then **the men**, having reached a spot where the trees were thinner, came suddenly in sight of the spectacle itself. Four of them **reeled**, one **fainted**, and two **were shaken into a frantic cry** which the mad cacophony of the orgy fortunately deadened. Legrasse dashed swamp water on the face of the fainting man, and **all stood trembling and nearly hypnotised with horror**. <...>. In a natural glade of the swamp stood a grassy island of perhaps an acre's extent, clear of trees and tolerably dry. On this now **leaped and twisted a more indescribable horde of human abnormality than any but a Sime or an Angarola could paint**. Void of clothing, **this hybrid spawn were braying, bellowing, and writhing about a monstrous ring-shaped bonfire** <...>. Duty came first; and **although there must have been nearly a hundred mongrel celebrants in the throng, the police relied on their firearms and plunged***

determinedly into the nauseous rout [11, p.94-95]; or in a Ukrainian text: <...> *Вільям* [a dead man] *рушив їм назустріч. Американець клигав уперед, загібаючи пісок однією ногою. Упав, але тут-таки піднявся: спершу над піском зринула понівечена голова, за нею корпус; далі – увесь зіпнувся на ноги. Ріно здригнувся, почувши, як за спиною лементує його найкращий боєць* [5, p.211]. Rules that are followed in the possible world of horror discourse presuppose that sources of horror are able to perform actions that are either impossible in the real world (and also purposefully malicious) or possible in the real world but are conventionally attributed to other subjects (like predicates of movement, speaking, intellectual activities and others that living dead do in the horror discourse). Sometimes the intention of the addresser to create the possible horrible world encounters the lack of language expressing possibilities; in this case he uses various means of comparison to correlate what he means with other objects of the real world for the addressee could understand his intention (*Burny begins to drool. There is nothing discreet about it, either. Burny drools like a wolf in a fairy tale, white curds of foamy spit leaking from the corners of his mouth and flowing over the slack, livercolored roll of his lower lip. The drool runs down his chin like a stream of soapsuds* [10, p.73]; *Та раптом, побачивши Ігореві очі, відсахнувся. Такої порожнечі він не зустрічав ніде й ніколи. Очей ніби не було. Тобто вони були, але наче... застигли. Скляні кульки, обрамлені крововиливами. Здавалося ті очі дивляться всередину, а не назовні* [5, p.88]. Structures of languages are different and means of comparison can be chosen by the addresser individually, still, the fact is that comparison as a logical procedure is one of the ways of introducing world creating predicates in the text and guaranteeing communication with the addressee.

Predicates that denote actions performed by sources of horror give the impulse to the further world creation according to the rules of this new world of horror: neither of the subject-source of horror's actions remains without

response. This responsive reaction is the reflection of the recipient's perception of the subject as horrific but the predication bases not on the conditional rules of the possible world of horror discourse but on the laws of real world – somatic and psychological reaction of a frightened person. First of all these are the predicates that denote all degrees of fear and the reaction of the body on the irritation: *My heart was thumping furiously; I felt bewildered and feverish* <...> [9, p.115]; *Gentlemen, my uncle opened his eyes so wide at all this, that, to the very last moment of his life, he used to wonder how it fell out that he had ever been able to shut'em again* [9, p.84]; <...> *побачив я нараз, як із брудно жовтої повені висунулася сніжно біла дитяча рука. Морозом ударило мене, я витріщив очі <...>. Я стояв, мов окаменілий* [2, p.19]; *Тимур уперше з часу вильоту з України відчув, як холодок неспокою заповзає під шкіру* [5, p. 76]. Secondly, these predicates can actualize the psychological reaction on fear known as “fight-or-flight response” when hormonal cascade is responsible for the reaction and the recipient of horror subconsciously decides either to stand the stressful experience or to escape and never risk the life. Compare the opposite reactions actualized in the possible world of horror discourse: *The cadaverous face fell away, and the sight of its caved-in forehead and unblinking eyes from between which thick blood had begun to ooze would awaken Leverett from nightmare on countless nights. But now Leverett tore free and fled* [11, p.213] – *She struggled and made terrible little mewling sounds trying to summon the words to cry out, and suddenly she crossed a line, and screamed up* <...> [11, p.129-130]; *Ріно схопив другого бота, ривком поставивши його на коліна. <...> Мачете втретє злетів у гору* [5, p.232] – *Ушивайтеся, якщо вам дороге ваше життя! – програміст кричав так, що ризикував зірвати собі голос* [5, p.216].

Concluding the analysis, it must be mentioned that world creating predicates perform an important role in the text production of examples of horror discourse. The material in two non-related languages has proved the fact

that reference made by predicates identifies the subject as a source of horror that is active, purposeful, and harmful. Also it has been shown that world creating predicates define further development of the text being built on the action and counteraction of subjects.

Reference

1. Антологія української готичної прози: у 2-х т. – Т. 1 / упорядкув. і передм. Ю.П. Винничука. – Харків: Фоліо, 2014.
2. Антологія української готичної прози: у 2-х т. – Т. 2 / упорядкув. і передм. Ю.П. Винничука. – Харків: Фоліо, 2014.
3. Арутюнова Н. Д. Лингвистические проблемы референции / Н. Д. Арутюнова // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – 1982. – Вып. XIII. – М.: Прогресс. – С. 5-40.
4. Бразговская Е. Е. Референция и отображение (от философии языка к философии текста) / Е.Е. Бразговская. – Пермь: Пермск.гос.пед.ун-т, 2006. – 192 с.
5. Кідрук М. Бот. Гуаякільський парадокс: роман / М. Кідрук. – Харків: Книжковий Клуб «Клуб Сімейного Дозвілля», 2015. – 512 с.: іл.
6. Растье Ф. Интерпретирующая семантика / Ф.Растье. Нижний Новгород: Деком, 2001.
7. Селиванова Е. А. Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации: Монографическое учебное пособие / Е.А.Селиванова. – К.: ЦУЛ, «Фитосоциоцентр», 2002. – 336 с.
8. Степанов Ю.С. Имена. Предикаты. Предложения: семиологическая грамматика / Ю.С.Степанов. М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2002.
9. Classic Victorian and Edwardian Ghost Stories / Selected by Rex Collins. – Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd., 1996. – 289 p.

10. King S., Straub P. Black House / Stephen King, Peter Straub. – HarperCollins Publishers. – 2001. – 390 p.
11. The Dark Descent / Ed. by David G. Hartwell. – New York: Tom Doherty Associates, Inc., 1987. – 1011 p.