

UDC 81'34.00(06)

LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF LYING**D. S. Shchypachova***National Technical University of Ukraine**“Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”*

shchipach@bk.ru

The article discusses the range of problems associated with the study of the linguistic side of communicative phenomenon of lying, which, being not only the socio-psychological component of human life in society, but also a kind of code of any communication, in recent years has increasingly turned the focus of research interest in different fields – philosophy, sociology, psychology, law and linguistics. False statements are presented as a component of a refusal system to a partner of the communication in the right to receive full information.

The study of lying in the communication, of issues related to the theme of “linguistics of lying”, has become especially intense in recent years. Attention of researchers of lying shifted from the question of how lying is formed in the language to the question of how it functions in speech communication and whether it is possible to measure its main parameters.

This article focuses on three important aspects of communicative phenomenon of lying in determining its relationship with linguistic mechanisms and coding system of the meaning of the utterance, on the one hand, and cultural systems of action in society – on the other hand. Relevant questions are grouped around three themes: 1) linguistics, 2) semiotics, 3) culture.

Keywords: communicative phenomenon of lying, communication code, false statement, refusal system component, linguistics of lying, linguistic mechanisms, semiotics and culture.

Introduction. The concept of a lying / false judgments from the very beginning has been actively studied in logic and philosophy as a possible opposition to the truth, sometimes the realness. This takes into account the semantic shades of the categories of “truth” and “realness”, “truth” involves a subjective connotation, i.e. element of personal attitude to the transmitted information, the term “realness” has the objective assessment of reality [7, p.244].

Deep enough and comprehensively was developed legal, or juristic, approach to the study of lying. In jurisprudence, but rather in criminology, in connection with lying it is better to speak of false testimony or false statements. False statements and false claims – are, first of all, the speech utterances, or false statements [8, p.176]. The classifications available in the jurisprudence have been studied to create the own false taxonomy of speech acts.

The study of lying in terms of psychology and sociology is a huge reservoir in the scientific study of the given concept. In these studies, interest origins of socialization of the individual, which takes into account all the stages of the formation of personality – from complete denial of respect for social norms to their conscious performance in order to avoid the condemnation of the team [3].

The linguistic aspect of the phenomenon of lying is the subject of any known at the present stage directions of linguistics (psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitology, pragmatolinguistics, linguo-cultural studies etc.), and at any level of language (phonetic, morphological, lexical and others.).

The purpose of this article is to develop a linguistic theory of the phenomenon of lying, to construct the model and its measurement and to identify language structures through which false information in modern communications is issued.

In accordance with the intended purpose the following **tasks** are:

1. The definition of the structure and function of the communicative phenomenon of lying;
2. The description of the characteristics of the actual philosophical, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, psycho-linguistic, linguo-cultural, pedagogical and linguistic aspects of the phenomenon of lying;

Theoretical problems of the description of communicative phenomenon.

The study of the outer side of phenomenon of lying, which was carried out through the study of philosophical, social, psychological and linguistic aspects of lying made it possible to distinguish and delineate various types of distortion of reality, which are grouped around four: insincerity of the sender, his concealing of the truth from the recipient, manipulation of the recipient, abuse of his trust [9, p.13].

Analysis of different approaches – philosophical (G.C. Huseynov (1989), D. I. Dubrovskiy (1990, 1994), O. A. Radchenko (2005), V. I. Svintsov (1990), A. K. Sekatskii (1994, 2000), A. Baruzzi (1996), M. Bettetini (2003), W. Betz (1962), T. Blume (1998), E. Brendel (1992), U. Eco (1977), L. Gustafsson (1980), R. Olschanski (2001), R. Ricur (1994), E. Schepper (1977), W. Shibles (2000), F. Sick, H. Pfeifer (2001)), logical (L. A. Vvedenskaya, L. G. Pavlova (1996), O. N. Laguta (2000)), the socio-psychological (N. V. Hladkih (2001), G. Grachev, J. Duprat (1905), I. Melnyk (2002), V. Znakov (1994), M. A. Krasnikov (1999), N. G. Lyubimova (2003), S. I. Simonenko (1998), A. N. Tarasov (2005), J. Bergmann (1998), S. Bok (1980), T. Brockmann (1991), H. Ernst (1986), K. Fiedler, J. Schmid (1998), U. Fullgrabe (1995), H. Lukesch (2003) K. Panhey (2003), J. Schmid (2003), and others.), legal (M. A. Baskakova (1998), A. A. Zakatov (1984), Forensics (1995), A. A. Leontiev, A. M. Shahnarovich, V. I. Batov (1977), V. A. Obraztsov (1995), L. Adam (1927), D. Busse (1992), F.-C. Schroder (1995)) and pedagogical (E. Byk (2005), V. V. Zenkovskiy (1996), P. Ekman (1993), W. Nolte (1927)) – to the study of the communicative phenomenon of lying made it possible to identify the general theoretical linguistic principles of its description [9].

The analysis of definitions of “lying” and “deception” in numerous studies allowed us to determine common causes of lying / deceit and forms of their manifestation, to establish their national cultural specifics [10, p.200]. Thus, in the Russian definitions of lying and deceit consciousness and deliberate nature of speech and behavioural actions that distort the truth, are expressed. The German definitions clearly indicate the recipient of false information, in particular the violation of his rights to obtain truthful information. The main criteria for the false statements with the position of the sender / recipient, relationship between them is determined by the significance of the study of lying for a range of disciplines – sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive science, linguistics, semiotics, and others.

Investigation of the structure and functions of the communicative phenomenon of lying allows justifying theoretically not enough represented linguistic aspects of the phenomenon in the scientific literature. Substantial characteristic of lying is given by defining its functions in accordance with the external components of the speech

situation of lying: metalinguistic, referent, emotive, phatic, poetic and impact one [6, p.43]. False statement, like any other, is the set of all functions. The main feature in the speech situation is the impact one. Impact on the recipient occurs as a result of successful substitution of true reality to false (the fact of that substitution is realized or not realized by the recipient) [4, p.15].

Dedicated functions of lying as a communicative phenomenon enabled to determine research areas, which analyze the linguistic side of lying and which formed the basis for the linguistic system-structural description of lying in the new scientific direction in native science – “linguistics of lying” [2, p.44].

The comparative analysis of the works allows us to conclude that linguists (this refers mainly to the study of German scientists) made a significant contribution to the study of lying (W. Abraham (1976, 1979), P. Aron (1927), S. Bok (1980), S. Dietz (2002), S. Donninghaus (1999), U. Eco (1985, 2002), E. Eggs (1976), K. Ehlich, K. Martens (1972), G. Falkenberg (1981 1982, 1984, 1985, 1986), R. Fischer (2003), D. Franck (1973), H. Frisk (1936), U. Fullgrabe (1995), B. Giese (1992), H. P. Grice (1957) , F. Hundsnurscher (1994), Kulturen der Lüge (2004), J. Meibauer (2005), C. Muller-Fraureuth (1965), V. Piwonka (2003), H. Vaichinger (1911), J. M. Vincent, C. Castelfranchi (1981), H. Wagner (1920), H. Weinrich (1966, 1986), P. Zagorin (1990), H. D. Zimmermann (1985), K. Zimmermann (1982), M. Zuckermann, R. E. Driver (1985)). Comprehensive study of lying allowed foreign scientists to identify independent direction – the “linguistics of lying” [2, p.44].

Linguistics of Lying. The stimulus for the study of the linguistic aspect of the false statements in the native and foreign researches was the work of H. Weinrich “Linguistics of Lying” (1966) [2]. This is evidenced by the reference of scholars who dealt with the issue of lying and deceit from different positions (V. V. Znakov (2000) [1], M. A. Krasnikov (1999) [8], J. Kubinova (2002), N. N. Panchenko (1999), S. Plotnikova (2000), V. I. Shahovskiy (2005) [11], S. Dietz (2001), G. Falkenberg (1982), R. Fischer (2003), B. Giese (1992), H.-J. Heringer (1977), R. Hettlage (2003) etc.).

In studies of foreign linguists the morphological, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic aspects of lying / deception are deeply studied, as well as individual speech acts (“be in error / be mistaken”), lying in the literary aspect, from the perspective of cognitive science, conversation implicative theory, cross-cultural communication [4, p.20]. Some of the researchers are trying to offer linguistic theories of lying (S. Dietz (2001), U. Eco (1989), G. Falkenberg (1982), F. Sick, H. Pfeifer (2001), H. Weinrich (1966) [2], but each offers to do it from a position of any one direction. As a result of analysis of the history and development of linguistic researches of lying in the Ukrainian and German philology, we have defined the main stages of “linguistics of lying” in Germany and Russia.

Currently, the concept of “linguistics of lying” is widely used by the scientists for all investigations of linguistic side of lying (A. B. Bushev (2003), S. N. Plotnikova (2000), V. I. Shahovskiy (2005) [11], G. Falkenberg (1982, 1984), B. Giese (1992), Kulturen der Lüge (2004), M. Piwonka (2003)).

By linguistic theory of lying we understand multilevel system of linguistic study of lying as a phenomenon of communication. In this system at each level theoretical results of the research of lying are summarized and integrated, which are

achieved with modern linguistic lines as linguistic philosophy, logical analysis of language, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, judicial linguistics, semiotics, cultural linguistics, literary studies.

Modern theories and concepts of lying in the aforementioned scientific directions are the subject field of “Linguistics of lying” [7]. Overview of the different theories and concepts allows us to conclude that linguistic theory of lying fits into the modern system of scientific knowledge as a complex direction, integrating knowledge about lying in language and speech. Conceptual basis of these theories has shown that they have the necessary methodological basis for allocation of “linguistics of lying” as an independent scientific direction for further construction of pragmalinguistic theory of lying.

Moreover, insufficiently developed both general issues of lying from the position of the theory of language (lying as a communicative phenomenon, reasoning effect of lying, false statements examination effectiveness), and private (as the definition of the concept of lying in pragmalinguistics, identifying of types of lying from the perspective of linguistic pragmatics, the definition of an effective nature of lying, detection of implications when transmitting a false report, culture of lying in the discourse) remain [9, p.18].

For the measurement of the phenomenon of lying in the communication method of analysis of communicative rules of verbal communication, method for calculating of conversation implications, conversation analysis of communication and cross-cultural pragmatics were suitable [9, p.28].

Conclusions. This study has a broad functional orientation and is connected with the application areas, in particular with research in the field of business communication (negotiating, conflict resolution); in judicial linguistics (legal communication, judicial linguistics); in political linguistics (in the analysis of interviews / speeches of politicians); in sociolinguistics (in the measurement of characteristics of professional communication); in psycholinguistics (in the measurement of gender / age lying). Prospects for the use of measurement models of lying are related to the further study of the influence of social factors on the design of lying in the speech; the study of cultural specifics of lying, the study of the influence of gender and age on the formation of false statements; as well as the study of the impact of false information.

Analysis of the definitions “lying” and “deception” in researches allowed not only to identify common causes of lying / deceit, which are conscious and deliberate speech and behavioral actions that distort the truth, but also to establish their cultural specifics.

Description of the phenomenon of lying as an object of linguistics involves determining its external and internal sides. The outer side of lying was investigated by studying the philosophical, social, psychological and linguistic aspects of lying. The inner side of the lying is defined in terms of its function: metalinguistic, referent, emotive, phatic, poetic and impact. A false statement is a set of all functions. Certain functions of the phenomenon of lying are treated as special manifestations of primary function of lying – impact. The definition of functions of lying has become a necessary basis for the linguistic system-structural description of lying in the new scientific field like linguistics of lying.

The study of the history of appearing and development of linguistic research of lying in foreign and native philology made it possible to establish the basic stages of linguistics of lying. To construct a linguistic theory of lying, the knowledge of lying, which is the part of the modern linguistic directions, is generalized.

REFERENCES

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Истина: фон и коннотации / Н. Д. Арутюнова // Логический анализ языка. Культурные концепты. – М.: Наука, 1991. – С.21-30.
2. Вайнрих Х. Лингвистика лжи / Х. Вайнрих // Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия: Переводы / общ. ред. В.В.Петрова. – М.: Прогресс, 1987. – С.44-87
3. Гладких Н. В. Ложь и двусмысленность / Н. В. Гладких [Электронный ресурс]. – 2001. – Режим доступа: <http://econom.nsc.ru/eco/arhiv>
4. Дубровский Д.И. Полуправда: ее природа и социальные функции / Д. И. Дубровский // Философские науки. – 1990. – №11. – С.15-27.
5. Дюпра Ж. Ложь / Ж.Дюпра. Пер. с фран. П.С.Феокритова. – Саратов: «Новь», 1905. – 97с.
6. Закатов А. А. Ложь и борьба с нею / А.А.Закатов. – Волгоград: Ниж. – Волж. кн. изд-во, 1984. –192 с.
7. Знаков В. В. Послесловие. Западные и русские традиции в понимании лжи: размышления российского психолога над исследованиями Пола Экмана // Экман П. Психология лжи. – СПб.: Питер, 2009. – С. 243-266.
8. Красников М. А. Феномен лжи в межличностном общении / М. А. Красников // Общественные науки и современность. – 1999. – №2. – С.176-186.
9. Морозова Е. И. Лингвальные аспекты лжи как когнитивно-коммуникативного образования (на материале современного английского языка) / Е.И.Морозова. автореф. дисс. на соискание науч.степени докт. филол. наук. спец.: 10.02.04 / Е. И. Морозова. – Киев, 2008. – 35с.
10. Попчук О.М. Лингвистические и паралингвистические средства реализации ложного всказывания в акте коммуникации / О. М. Попчук: автореф. дис на соискание науч.степени канд. филол. наук. спец.10.02.21: – М., 2006. – 20с.
11. Шаховский В. И. Человек лгущий в реальной и художественной коммуникации / В.И.Шаховский // Человек в коммуникации: аспекты исследования. –Волгоград: Перемена, 2005. – С.173-204
12. Экман П. Психология лжи / П.Экман. – СПб.: Питер, 2000. – 272с.

REFERENCES

1. Arutjunova, N.I. (1991). Truth: background and connotation. Logical analysis of language. Cultural concepts, 21-30 [in Russian].
2. Vajnrih, H. (1987) Linguistics of lying. Language and social coordination modelling, 44-87 [in Russian].
3. Gladkih, N.V. (2001) Lying and ambiguity. Retrieved from [http: econom.nsc.ru/eco/arhiv](http://econom.nsc.ru/eco/arhiv) [in Russian]
4. Dubrovskij, D.I (1990). Half-truth: its nature and social functions. Philosophical sciences,11, 15-27 [in Russian].
5. Djupra, Zh. Lying./ Zh.Djupra. Trans. P.S. Feokritova. - Saratov, Russia: "Nov", 1905. 97 p. [in Russian].

6. Zakatov, A.A. (1984). Lying and battle with it. Volgograd: Nizh.-Volzh, Russia. kn. izd-vo [in Russian].
7. Znakov, V.V. (2009). Afterwords. West and Russian traditions of lying comprehension: speculations of the Russian psychologist about the research of P. Ekman. In: Jekman P. Psihologija Izhi. SPb, , Russia: Piter [in Russian].
8. Krasnikov, M.A. (1999). Lying phenomenon in interindividual communication. Social sciences and modern world, 2, 176-186 [in Russian].
9. Morozova, E.I. (2008). Lingual aspects of lying as cognitive communicative phenomenon. Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis. Kiev, Ukraine [in Russian].
10. Popchuk, O.M. (2006). Linguistic and paralinguistic means of realization of false statement in communication act: Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis. Moscow, Russia [in Russian].
11. Shahovskij, V.I. (2004). Lying individual in real and fiction communication. In: Individual in communication: research aspects. Volgograd, Russia: Peremena, 2005 [in Russian].
12. Jekman, P. Psychology of lying. SPb, Russia: Piter [in Russian].

Д.С. Щипачова. Лінгвістичні аспекти неправди.

Стаття розглядає коло проблем, що пов'язані з дослідженням лінгвістичного боку комунікативного феномену неправди, який, будучи не лише соціально-психологічним компонентом життєдіяльності людини в суспільстві, але й певним кодом будь-якої комунікації, останнім часом все частіше привертає увагу дослідників самих різноманітних напрямків – філософії, соціології, психології, юриспруденції та лінгвістики. Неправдивий вислів представлений як компонент системи відмови партнеру по комунікації в праві на отримання повноцінної інформації.

Вивчення неправди в комунікації, питань, що пов'язані з темою «лінгвістика неправди», стало особливо інтенсивним останнім часом. Увага дослідників брехні перемикнулася з питання про те, як оформлюється брехня в мові, на питання про те, як вона функціонує в мовному спілкуванні і чи можливо виміряти її основні параметри.

Ця стаття присвячена трьом важливим аспектам комунікативного феномену неправди, що визначають взаємовідношення з лінгвістичними механізмами та системою кодування, з одного боку, та з культурною системою дій в суспільстві – з іншого боку. Виділені питання згруповані навколо трьох тем: 1) лінгвістика, 2) семіотика, 3) культура.

Ключові слова: комунікативний феномен неправди, код комунікації, неправдивий вислів, компонент системи відмови, лінгвістика неправди, лінгвістичні механізми, семіотика, культура.

Д.С. Щипачева. Лингвистический аспекты неправды

В статье рассматриваются проблемы, связанные с исследованием лингвистической стороны коммуникативного феномена лжи, которая являясь не только социально-психологическим компонентом жизнедеятельности человека в обществе, играет также роль своеобразного кода любой коммуникации, в последнее время все чаще оказывается предметом изучения самых разных направлений – философии, социологии, психологии, юриспруденции и лингвистики. Ложное высказывание представлено как компонент системы отказа партнеру по коммуникации в праве получить полноценную информацию.

Исследование лжи в коммуникации, проблем, которые связаны с вопросом «лингвистика лжи», стало особенно интенсивным в последнее время. Внимание ученых феномена лжи переключилось с вопроса о том, как оформляется ложь в языке, на вопрос о том, каковы ее функции в речевом общении и каким образом можно измерить ее основные параметры.

Настоящая статья посвящена трем важным аспектам коммуникативного феномена лжи, которые определяют его взаимоотношения с лингвистикой и системой кодирования смысла высказывания, с одной стороны, и с культурной системой действий в обществе – с другой стороны. Выделенные проблемы сгруппированы вокруг трех тем: 1) лингвистика, 2) семиотика, 3) культура.

Ключевые слова: коммуникативный феномен лжи, код коммуникации, ложное высказывание, компонент системы отказа, лингвистика лжи, лингвистические механизмы, семиотика, культура.