

COMMUNICATIVE SADISM IN THE ASPECT OF ECOLINGUISTICS

Kseniia Taranenko

PhD, Associate Professor, University of Customs and Finance, Ukraine
e-mail: xtaranenko@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0001-6518-0426

Summary

The article is devoted to the current direction of modern linguistic research – ecolinguistics, which is based on the principles of ecocentrism. The article analyzes the concept of communicative sadism as a form of psychological violence. The study was conducted in the aspect of ecolinguistics at the intersection of semantics, ecology, psychology, communicative linguistics and linguistic pragmatics. The focus is on the scientific achievements of foreign and domestic linguists, emphasizing their common and different vectors of scientific research. Considerable attention is paid to the actual concept of ecological and non-ecological communication, tactics, techniques and means of expressing direct and indirect (hidden) aggression. The main strategies of the linguistic behaviour of the communicative sadist are outlined, as well as non-verbal means of expression of implicit aggression: para- and extra-linguistic, optic-kinetic and models of organization of the space and time of the communicative situation.

Keywords: ecolinguistic, ecological communication, communicative sadism, implicit aggression, invective, rational-heuristic, courtly strategy.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23856/3813>

1. Introduction

Modern society is increasingly contemplating the need for harmonization, preservation and protection of the environment. And this concerns not only environmental activities but also affects all spheres of human activity. Undeniably, the regulation of communicative interaction, which should lead to harmonization of relations between people, possesses not the last position in this process. To achieve this goal, modern science requires the expansion of general concepts, the integration of independent disciplines in certain scientific fields. As a result of the transfer of the concept of ecology as a doctrine of the environment in the linguistic sphere, was the emergence of interdisciplinary science – ecolinguistics.

Language ecology studies speech as a holistic integrated system, determines the features of co-operation in the speech of versatile means of communication in interaction with the speech environment, examines the linguistic environment in a broad historical, socio-political, and cultural context, taking into account changes that are constantly occurring in society and people's consciousness (*Radu, 2013: 193*).

2. From the history of ecolinguistic

Ecolinguistics is a new contemporary research area with a wide range of discussed issues. To speak about the ecology of language scientists began relatively recently, considering it within the limits of psychology, anthropology and sociology of language. The view at the language as a living organism, which is subject to the rules of evolution, also contributes to the establishment of this term. It is believed that it was E. Haugen who in 1972 introduced the concept of the ecology of the language and defined this scientific direction as the study of

interaction between any given language and its environment, which is a society, a nation that uses this language as one of its codes (*Haugen, 1972*). However, A. Haugen himself had already relied on the work of K. and F. Völings and N. Schutz, “The Language Situation in Arizona as Part of the Southwest Culture Area”, in which the ecology of the language was divided into inner-lingual and inter-lingual (*Haugen, 1972*). E. Haugen understood the interaction of ecology and language in the aspect of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. Namely, the ecology of language, according to E. Haugen, is determined primarily by people who learn the language, use it and pass it on to others (*Haugen, 1972*). After the release of E. Haugen's work, scientists began to swiftly explore the problems of ecolinguistics, which mainly concerned the decline of languages, their extinction, linguistic planning, etc. (U. Smolley, R. Dickson, P. Mühlhoisler). At the conference of the International Association of Applied Linguistics M. Halliday pointed out that ecology and language have a direct impact on each other, namely: language affects the human consciousness, and the human, accordingly, has an impact on the environment in which he lives, and consequently on environmental ecology (*Halliday, 2001*).

In modern science, there are three basic approaches to understanding of ecolinguistics. Firstly, it is a branch of linguistics that studies the integrity of the language in its direct connection with culture and semiosphere. Secondly, it is a system of knowledge of the energy of the word, of its effective force. Thirdly, it is the doctrine of the spiritual nature of the word, of its profound relationship with the person, with the nature and destiny of the people.

The fundamental postulate of linguistic ecology is that the expression of all spheres of the personality through the semiotics and semantics of verbal and nonverbal language is the most important environmental, linguistic and valeological factor that determines the quality of communication and the quality of life in general (*Volkova, 2012*).

3. Ecological and non-ecological communication

Within the framework of modern understanding of ecolinguistic, the issues of establishing ecological communication are topical. Undoubtedly such a strong interest in ecolinguistic issues is associated with the rapid development of aggression and hostility as a whole society as well as its particular representatives.

In the broadest sense, ecological communication is understood as communication, which does not cause harmful influence on health in general, does not affect not only physically but also does not commit violent actions in relation to the emotional, cognitive, behavioural and communicative spheres of an individual. Consequently, any verbal or non-verbal means, strategies or tactics of communicative behaviour that contradict communicative-pragmatic and ethical-language norms and adversely affect a person's mental health can be qualified as non-ecological. Environmental communication, accordingly, is not only in the ability to adequately encode and decode information, but also in the ability to maintain a positive emotional state of a partner in communication, caring for his psycho-emotional health.

In non-ecological communication communicants deliberately exercise a negative influence on person's emotional, cognitive, behavioural and communicative spheres. The impact on the emotional sphere of the personality of the communicative partner is achieved through emotional pressure, threats, intimidation, humiliation, the image of the victim and his relatives, ignoring, neglect, rejection, abuse, depreciation of the feelings of the victim, accusation, etc. (*Hein, 2013*). The cognitive sphere of personality is affected by the depreciation of the intelligence of the addressee and attempts to persuade the addressee in his psychological inadequacy (*Sonkin, 2011*). Normal manifestation of the person's behavioural domain is blocked

by coercion, prohibition, total control, isolation, rejection, persecution and the threat of punishment for certain actions (*Volkov, 202: 94*). Negative effect on the communicative sphere is achieved by the restriction of friends circle, the control of all communications, criticism, vocation, the absence of positive moments in communication (*Gorshkova, Shurygina, 2003*).

In her work, N. Solodovnikova conducted an ecolinguistic monitoring, which revealed the following unhealthy phenomena and tendencies in communication:

- depletion of lexicon and phraseological resources;
- unmotivated replacement of spoken words by borrowed words;
- jargon of speech;
- violations of stylistic norms;
- speech vulgarity;
- illiteracy (*Solodovnikova, 2010*).

Consequently, the danger to the language system (as well as to the mental health of society) carries the painful growth of the sphere of substandard linguistic elements such as: slang, cursory, obscene vocabulary, the aggressive spread of words of foreign origin, the spread of “language of hostility” and conflictive texts, violation of the borders of the sovereign linguistic consciousness of an individual, the use of manipulative techniques and technologies in the processes of communication. Slang speech, the use of obscene vocabulary, speech vulgarity and language manipulation are all means, techniques and tactics of the speech behaviour of communicative violence over the will of another person. Disharmonious and non-ecological communication negatively affects one, several or all of the spheres of the individual's identity, which causes the phenomenon of communicative sadism.

4. Strategies of communicative sadism

Communicative sadism is one of the manifestations of a broad problem of psychological violence, which a priori should be classified as non-ecological communication. A broad understanding of sadism as a predisposition to causing purposeless torture to others is interpreted as any violent action – mental or physical (*Taranenko, 2018*). The main purpose of the insult is to diminish the social status of the opponent and thus to assert someone's superiority (*Stavytska, 2008*).

The desire of the individual to exalt on account of humiliation or moral destruction of the interlocutor forms the basis of non-ecological communication, which determines the main ways of its self-realization through communicative sadism. The demonstration of communicative sadism includes speech acts that are substitutes for the tactics of physical violence, which cause offence of an opponent, affect his pride, dignity and honour (*Bilokonenko, 2012: 122*).

Sadism as a concept is primarily associated with physical aggression. However, the perception of violence exclusively as a causation of physical damage is not exhaustive. Less noticeable, but no less harmful is communicative sadism (*Taranenko, 2018*).

Communicative sadism is difficult to determine, since any violence refers to socially inappropriate patterns of behaviour that are condemned by society, and some are punishable by law. At the end of the twentieth century, K. Sedov introduced the concept of communicative sadism and its strategies – invective, courtly, and rational-heuristic (*Sedov, 2004*).

The most common non-ecological communication scenario is the invective strategy of speech behaviour, which represents a diminished significance: communicative expressions here represent a reflection of emotional and biological reactions and are an affective discharge in the form of abuse (invective), for example: *Чого ти ревели? Досить уже нюні розводити,*

шмаркачко! Я тобі зараз покажу! Припини, сказав! Я тобі покажу, де раки зимують, услідна бездарна шмаркачка (Kuiava, 2015). (Translation of the author: *Why are you howling? Stop acting like a crybaby, you snorter! I'll show you up! Stop it, I said! I will skin you alive, dirty bastard*).

The rational-heuristic strategy of speech behaviour in a conflict situation, on the contrary, is based on prudence:

A: Славо, ти недочуваєш?! Тебе для мене більше немає! Все, ти випарувалася! Стала невидимою! Йди краще, речі збирай! – Чоловік був твердим.

B: Але ж я людина, Матвію, я жива, і мені боляче... Нащо ти мене роздираєш, ніби і все на світі можу стерпіти? Ти ж вириваєш мені серце, ріжеш по живому! – Чеслава чутно захлипала.

A: Ти сама себе ріжеш. Спокійно зберися і без істерик їдь додому, до матері, – холодно проказав, запарюючи вже другу чашку чаю (Kuiava, 2015).

(Translation of the author:

A: *Are you deaf, Slava? You don't exist for me! That's all, you've disappeared! Became invisible! You'd better go and get your stuff!* – *The husband was steadfast.*

B: *But I am a human, Matvii, I am alive and I am hurting... Why are you tearing me up as if I can survive anything? You are breaking my heart, cutting down alive!* – *Cheslava cried audibly.*

A: *You are cutting down yourself. Calmly get ready and without hysteria go home, to your mother; – coldly said, already making the second cup of tea for himself.*

The curtly strategy differs from the invective high semioticity of speech behaviour, due to the attraction of the speaker to etiquette forms of social interaction. Proponents of the courtly strategy of behaviour have a tendency to indirect means of expressing disagreement and disguise the display of negative emotions under etiquette formulas, for example: if you don't mind; could you please; could I ask you for a favour; will you be so kind and so on? Such a strategy of conflict does not have formal indications of verbal aggression, but the pronunciation of such ostentatious etiquette formulas with a familiarized tone can bring the opponent almost to rage, affecting his self-respect, dignity or honour.

As you can see, the range of techniques of communicative sadist is not limited to open verbal aggression (invective, threats, accusations, insults, blames, mockery, etc.). Externally, "ecological" behaviour patterns are in fact methods of hidden verbal or nonverbal aggression: systematic supercilious pressure without the open demonstration of hostile emotions, silence, refusal to speak, mimic and kinaesthetic gestures, various non-verbal actions, with the exception of physical attack. Ecolinguistics should also take into account the so-called legitimate or latent aggression. Its expressions are quite vividly and clearly described in the work of psychologist and psychotherapist F. Riman: "The ability to give legitimacy to their aggressiveness that has reached the degree of sadism is extremely diverse – an official who punctually, to the minute closes the window of his office, although he could easily serve someone else; a teacher who emphasizes the slightest deviations in punctuation or mistakes due to inattention; an examiner, who considers the answer to be correct only if it is not different from the expected one; a judge who strictly adheres to the letter of the law when assessing a violation and does not take into account motivation, etc. You can find many other examples of hidden sadism. Some individuals express aggression in the form of super-correctness, abusing their power and concealing the motives of their behaviour even from themselves, referring to the inviolability of the rules and the significance of their duty" (Riman, 2007: 34).

Communicative sadism is difficult to determine at the level of language, since any violence refers to socially inappropriate behaviour patterns that are condemned by society, and

some are punishable by law (Volkova, 2012). Significant semantic burden in communicative sadism is placed on indirect – extra-linguistic – means of communication, which cause an equally strong pragmatic influence on the addressee. The causation of physical or psychological harm may not be vocalized by the aggressor, but is effectively transmitted by non-language elements of the organization of communication. Non-verbal means of expressing threats include those of para- and extra-linguistic, optic-kinetic as well as means of organizing the space and time of the communicative situation.

Para- and extra-linguistic means of communicative sadist include intonation, timbre, volume, and manner of speaking, for example: *to speak evilly, with threat in the voice, in suppressed whisper, to whisper in vain, to be reddened by rage, to pour blood.*

Optical and kinetic means of expression of violence include movements and gestures that usually accompany a violent speech act: *threaten with finger, raise your hand, show your fist, simulate a blow, beat your fist in your own hand, and show a gesture-imitation of a clipping of a head or the use of firearms.*

In an effort to cause the strongest emotion of fear at the addressee, speakers-aggressors usually resort to a special organization of space – for this they reduce the distance of communication: *menacingly approach, bend over or lean.*

5. Conclusion

Considering communicative sadism from the standpoint of the ecology of communication, we came to the conclusion that communicative sadism expresses the absolute non-ecological interpersonal interaction. Given the strategies of communicative sadistic behaviour it becomes clear that both verbal and nonverbal means of communication are indicators of ecological or non-ecological communication as language becomes a sign of violence not through means and techniques, but the motives, intentions and emotions of the author. So, in determining whether a particular situation of communicating is an example of communicative sadism, we can be guided only by two reliable criteria: the destructive intention and the emotional state of the subjects of communication. The main purpose of the sadist is to somehow cause fear and pain in the opponent, that is, those affects that are extremely destructive and non-ecological to the individual, blocking his ability to personal freedom manifestations. Communicative sadist is confident in his rightness; he does not show empathy and by that he destroys the health of the recipient not only in a psychological but also in a physical way.

References

- Bilokononko, L. A. (2012). *Peioratyvna y invektyvna leksyka v mizhosobystnomu konflikti [Pejorative and invective vocabulary in interpersonal conflict]. Filolohichni studii, 7, 119–127 [in Ukrainian].*
- Gorshkova, I. D., Shurygina, I. I. (2003). *Nasilie nad zhenami v russkih semyah [Violence against wives in Russian families]. Retrieved January 10, 2020, from <http://www.womenmsu.msu.ru/appendix/bookall.pdf> [in Russian].*
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2001). *New ways of meaning: the challenge to applied linguistics. The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment. London, New York: Continuum [in English].*
- Haugen, E. (1972). *The Ecology of Language. Stanford University Press. [in English].*

- Hein, S. (2010). *Emotional Abuse*. Retrieved January 10, 2020, from <http://eqi.org/eabuse1.htm> [in English].
- Kuiava, Zh. (2015). *Derevo, shcho roste v meni [The tree growing in me]*. Kharkiv: Knyzhkovyi klub "Klub Simeinoho Dozvillia" [in Ukrainian].
- Radu, A. (2013). *Movna ekolohiia: napriamy ta problemy doslidzhennia [Language Ecology: Directions and Problems of Research]*. *Humanitarna osvita v tekhnichnykh vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladakh*, 27, 191–197 [in Ukrainian].
- Riman, F. (2007). *Basic forms of fear. Research in the field of depth psychology*. Retrieved January 30, 2020, from http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Psihol/Riman/ [in English].
- Sedov, K. F. (2004). *Diskurs i lichnost: jevoljucija kommunikativnoj kompetencii [Discourse and personality: the evolution of communicative competence]*. Moscow: Labirint [in Russian].
- Solodovnikova, N. (2010). *Jekologicheskaja jemocional'naja komunikacija. [Ecological Emotive Communication (on the example of election creolized newspaper texts)]*. Volgograd: Change [in Russian].
- Sonkin, D. J. *Defining psychological maltreatment in Domestic Violence Perpetration Treatment Program*. Retrieved January 30, 2020, from <http://www.danielsonkin.com/articles/PsychAb.html> [in English].
- Stavytska, L. (2008). *Ukrainska mova bez tabu: slovnyk netsenzurnoi leksyky ta yii vidpovidnykiv [Ukrainian language without taboo: dictionary of obscene vocabulary and its correspondences]*. Kyiv: Krytyka [in Ukrainian].
- Taranenko, K. V. (2018). *Komunikatyvnyi sadyzm yak osoblyvyi typ verbalnoi ahresii [Communicative sadism as a special type of verbal aggression]*. *Molodyi vchenyi*, 2(54), 213–215 [in Ukrainian].
- Taranenko, K.V. (2019). *Kurtuazna stratehiia movlennievoyi povedinky komunikatyvnoho sadysta [The Courtly Strategy of Speech Behavior of a Communicative Sadist]*. *Psykholinhivistyka*, 25(2), 290–306 [in Ukrainian].
- Volkov, Ye. N. (2002). *Kryteryi, pryznaky, opredelenija y klasyfikacyi vrednykh psyhologhycheskykh posledstvyi: psyhologhycheskaja travma, psyhologhycheskaja aghressyja y psyhologhycheskoe nasylye. [Criteria, signs, definitions and classifications of harmful psychological effects: psychological trauma, psychological aggression and psychological violence]*. *Zhurnal praktycheskogho psyhologha*, 6, 83–199 [in Russian].
- Volkova, Ja. A. (2012). *Kommunikativnaja lichnost v cennostnyh parametroh nejekologichnogo obshhenija [Communicative personality in the values of non- environmental communication]*. *Izvestija Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta*, 8(72), 4–7 [in Russian].