



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2023.1.12>

UDC 81'23:366.63
LBC 81.006

Submitted: 29.09.2022
Accepted: 05.12.2022

**COMMUNICATIVE CATEGORY OF *ALTERITY*:
LINGUOCULTURAL AND LINGUOECOLOGICAL PROPERTIES**

Evgenia Y. Kislyakova

Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Volgograd, Russia

Sergey Grinev-Grinevich

State Higher Professional School after Edward Shchepanik in Suvalki, Suvalki, Poland

Elvira A. Sorokina

Moscow Region State Pedagogical University, Mytishchi, Russia;
Russian University of Transport, Moscow, Russia

Sanya I. Madzhaeva

Astrakhan State Medical University, Astrakhan, Russia

Abstract. The aim of the article is to give an in-depth insight into *alterity* as a communication category in the cognitive and discursive aspects. Being an indispensable part of communication and cognition, the category has its own meaning presenting the communicative interaction within the frame “I – the Other”. The category of *alterity* has its own set of category properties, which are specified uniquely in different languages. *Alterity* as a linguistic category may express an outlook on the reality (similar, i.e. familiar, devoid of risk: other, different, vague, evidently evoking fear or curiosity). In the Russian language, it is linked to the emotional clusters of *curiosity, fear, suspense*, whereas in the English language it is associated with *curiosity, admiration, surprise and novice*. *Alterity* is characterized similarly in English and Russian through maintaining such features as *dissimilarity, variety, multifariousness, belonging to different classes/groups, distinct opposition*. As well as common features, *alterity* manifests culturally specific meanings in English (*being eccentric, revolutionary, new, fresh*) and Russian (*being funny and incongruous*). The article includes a description of the linguistic means and communicative strategies and tactics, with the help of which the category of *alterity* is realized in fiction. The category content is variable in the discourse and it serves ground for the ecological and non-ecological mode of communication.

Key words: communicative mindset, communicative category, alterity, category properties, culturally relevant differences, ecological mode of communication, non-ecological mode of communication.

Citation. Kislyakova E.Y., Grinev-Grinevich S., Sorokina E.A., Madzhaeva S.I. Communicative Category of *Alterity*: Linguocultural and Linguoecological Properties. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], 2023, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 151-161. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2023.1.12>

УДК 81'23:366.63
ББК 81.006

Дата поступления статьи: 29.09.2022
Дата принятия статьи: 05.12.2022

**КОММУНИКАТИВНАЯ КАТЕГОРИЯ ИНАКОСТИ:
ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ И ЛИНГВОЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ**

Евгения Юрьевна Кислякова

Волгоградский государственный социально-педагогический университет, г. Волгоград, Россия

Сергей Гринев-Гриневич

Государственная высшая профессиональная школа им. Эдварда Щепаника в Сувалках, г. Сувалки, Польша

Эльвира Анатольевна Сорокина

Московский государственный областной педагогический университет, г. Мытищи, Россия;
Российский университет транспорта, г. Москва, Россия

Санья Ибрагимовна Маджаева

Астраханский государственный медицинский университет, г. Астрахань, Россия

Аннотация. В статье дается развернутый анализ инакости как категории коммуникации в когнитивном и дискурсивном аспектах. Будучи неотъемлемым компонентом коммуникации и когниции, инакость характеризуется определенным содержанием, раскрывающимся в рамках коммуникативного взаимодействия «Я – Другой». Е.Ю. Кисляковой установлено, что инакость имеет свой набор категориальных признаков, которые объективируются в различных языках посредством универсальных и национально-маркированных конкретизаторов. Обнаружены схожие значения, свойственные как английскому, так и русскому языкам: «непохожесть», «отсутствие подобия»; «разнообразие», «отнесенность к различным классам / группам»; «четкая противопоставленность / оппозиционирование», а также различия в концептуализации инакости средствами английского и русского языков: признак яркости, необычности на фоне других, индивидуальности, чудачества, изменения, чего-то революционного и свежего в английской лингвокультуре на фоне русской. В русском языке, в сопоставлении с английским, обнаруживаются такие характеристики, как забавность и смехотворность. С. Гринев-Гриневичем описаны языковые средства и коммуникативные стратегии и тактики реализации инакости в художественном дискурсе. С.И. Маджаевой и Э.А. Сорокиной доказано, что содержание данной категории варьируемо в коммуникативном процессе, что обуславливает экологичность / неэкологичность общения.

Ключевые слова: коммуникативное сознание, коммуникативная категория, инакость, категориальные признаки, лингвокультурные различия, экологичность общения, неэкологичность общения.

Цитирование. Кислякова Е. Ю., Гринев-Гриневич С., Сорокина Э. А., Маджаева С. И. Коммуникативная категория инакости: лингвокультурные и лингвоэкологические характеристики // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2, Языкознание. – 2023. – Т. 22, № 1. – С. 151–161. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2023.1.12>

Introduction

Modern linguistic science postulates the fact that the human being is apt to perceive and assimilate new elements of knowledge within uniform cognitive frameworks. Different people share obviously similar needs and aims of communication, which, on the one hand, explains a number of certain uniform principles of the world perception, and on the other hand, sufficient similarity in the forms of cognitive functioning [Langacker, 1999]. However, along with the common ways of mirroring the reality each individual is characterized by unique personal views on the world that determine their understanding of it [Semenova, 2009]. This uniqueness is also strengthened by the emotive aspect of communication through each interlocutor's manifestation of their emotional deixis, emotional intellect as well as use of

emotionally coloured language means [Shakhovskiy, 2019a; 2019b].

Even such basic notions as “other”, “the same”, “this”, “that”, which are classified as basic determiners by A. Vezhbitskaya [2001], may turn out to possess a number of culturally and emotively specific meanings, arrayed in different language forms. *Alterity* is to be considered in terms of universally basic notions, forming a key concept in this or that language and requiring certain linguistically and culturally specific categorization.

In contemporary humanitarian science, *alterity* is viewed as a complementary category, and its content is elaborated through philosophical, psychological, religious, sociological, literary as well as linguistic research (M. Bakhtin, E. Benveniste, M. Buber, H.-G. Gadamer, E. Husserl, G. Deleuze, J. Kristeva, J. Lacan, E. Levinas, J. Lotman, J.-P. Sartre, S. Freud, M. Foucault, M. Heidegger, C.G. Jung et al.).

If viewed philosophically, the category of *alterity* is contemplated as a binary entity, as it presupposes a meaningful correlation of one and the other in regard to distinguishing similarities and differences. Naturally, the language reflects the person's capability of perceiving the world and understanding it in all its peculiarities and manifestations [Kubryakova, 2004, p. 17]. While recognizing the mediating function of the language in the processes of categorization and conceptualization, it is to be questioned in this article, on the strength of which linguistic and communicative means the language embodies the perception of *alterity*.

Material and methods

The aim of the article is to give an in-depth insight into *alterity* as a communication category in the cognitive and discursive aspects. The linguistic analysis specifically focuses on the key properties of the communication category of *alterity* in modern English, with the Russian language means serving as a comparable background for identifying culturally specific meanings of the category under study.

Addressing the study of *alterity* as a communication category is enhanced by the following issues:

- 1) it facilitates understanding of the communicative mindset and communication categories as its main constituents;
- 2) it specifies the range of the principles and mechanisms of communication;
- 3) it extrapolates the methodologically relevant content of the humanitarian category of *alterity* into the linguistic branch of study, enlarging the conceptual means of communicology and the interpretation tools of linguistic research;
- 4) it allows to draw correlation between *alterity* and associatively connected categories with the view of improving the lexicographic aspect of its rendering in modern Russian and English;
- 5) it requires an in-depth discursive analysis which is to result in extracting implicit subtle properties of the category.

The results of the research are verified with the help of the following methods employed in the research: the analysis of key notions, comparative analysis, contextual analysis, discursive analysis.

Each of the scientific methods was used at a definite stage of the study:

1) the analysis of the key notions included a component-definitional analysis of the category concept – *alterity*, as well as all linguistic means, forming the same thesaurus and associative word-fields with it, which was carried out with the help of the semantic stretching of the key notion via interpretational analysis of its synonyms, antonyms, etymological analysis and construction of the nominative clusters of the parameters of the category;

2) the comparative analysis was employed in identifying culturally specific properties of *alterity* in the English language as considered in the background of the Russian language;

3) the contextual and discursive analysis of classic and contemporary British fiction consisted of defining macro- and microcontexts which allowed to trace the connection of one communicative event with another; at the next step the contexts were analyzed by such criteria as the topic and the participants (status roles and communicative situations), chronotope, communicative environment, communicative strategies and tactics, communicators' intentions, etc.

The research employs linguistic material of both the Russian and English languages. The key concepts and their specifiers are analyzed with the help of the data available in contemporary dictionaries of meanings, synonyms, antonyms and thesaurus (more than 350 lexical means – over 200 and 150 for Russian and English respectively). The discursive part of the analysis is carried out with the aid of literary contexts (345 contexts) from classic and contemporary British prose, marked by *alterity* as the key topic.

Results and discussion

The term *alterity* itself has been defined under philosophical scrutiny as a spectrum of notions and ideas, contributing on the whole to the idea of “otherness”, strictly being in the sense of the other of two (Latin *alter*). The concept was established by Emmanuel Lévinas in a series of essays, collected under the title *Alterity and Transcendence* [Levinas, 1999].

Within the frames of modern humanitarian discourse *alterity* appears to be a category that realizes the relations between the I and the Other

and depends on the following interpretations of the Other: 1) another I (the Other in the structure of the I); 2) You as *the Other* (opposed to any other); 3) the Other as any other; 4) the Other as a stranger, alien, foreigner, outsider [Dorogavtseva, 2009]. The above mentioned interpretation leads to the following definition of *alterity*: a category of Subject-Subject and/or Subject-Object relations between *the I* and *the Other* as realized through self-identity as well as at the levels of interpersonal, social and intercultural communication. As a result, the category of *alterity* is of key relevance to how the communicative interaction is structured.

Culturally relevant properties of alterity as a communicative category

In our previous research [Kislyakova, 2018] we came to the conclusion about a complex conceptual structure of the category of *alterity*, which is presented in its binary properties defined as its parameters. These parameters are viewed as opposing subcategories: singularity – plurality, identity – non-identity, similarity – difference, normality – abnormality, nativity – strangeness, definiteness – indefiniteness, reality – unreality.

Alterity is mainly an implicit category, which can get explicit under a particular context, marked by certain linguistic and stylistic means. Like any other communication category, *alterity* is closely connected with the notion of the communicative norm, understood as a set of speaking rules accepted by a society and determining different types of verbal interaction in various situations. The core component of the communicative norm is the principle of communicative relevance, adequacy of verbal performance in a certain communicative situation. Here comes into logical view Hymes's SPEAKING model of communication, in which each of the letters stands for a respectively abbreviated word – setting, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities (linguistic means), norms of interaction, genres [Hymes, 1974]. So the speaker's choice of the communicative strategy and tactics has a crucial influence on the course of interaction and its effectiveness as well as ecological/non-ecological mode.

Alterity as a communication category determines the following functions of interaction:

1) orientative function, when the *Other* appears to be a 'guide' in adapting oneself to the setting;

2) manipulative function, which is realized on condition of unequal statuses of participants, thus leading to a conflicting type of communication.

Speaking about the unequal status, we mean the communicative status rather than the social one. As an example, illustrating the latter function is the situation of communicative inequality rendered in one of the novels by David Lodge:

(1) Then we went to Anitkabir to lay a wreath on Ataturk's tomb. <...> Mr. Custer thought it would be a nice gesture. And a funny thing happened <...> Perhaps I should not have told Professor Swallow that it was a capital offence to show disrespect to the memory of Ataturk. <...> I said it as a kind of joke. However, he seemed to be very worried by the information. <...> Anyway, Mr. Custer told him, 'Don't worry, just do exactly what I do.' So we march down the concourse, Mr. Custer in front carrying the wreath, and Professor Swallow and I following in step, under the eyes of the soldiers. <...> And then Mr. Custer had the misfortune to trip over a paving stone that was sticking up and, being impeded by the wreath, fell on to his hands and knees. Before I could stop him, Professor Swallow flung himself to the ground and lay prostrate like a Muslim at prayer (Lodge, 1984, p.180).

As the given example shows, the British professor is worried about causing a conflict by putting himself in the wrong, as he is not fully aware of the SPEAKING criteria of the situation described. He is forced to imitate the behavior of the people around and he is manipulated by signs that he tends to misinterpret, thus revealing his otherness.

In the theory of communication it has been established to differentiate the notions *other* and *familiar* [Hogrebe, 1993]. But this differentiation is more likely to be indicated as the opposition *insider / outsider*. However, in the social, historic and imagined dimensions culture is viewed as heterogeneous: being members of the same discourse community, people still have different life experiences and biographies, they also differ in age, gender or ethnicity, they may have different political opinions and preferences; moreover, cultures definitely change over time [Kramsch, 1998]. Therefore, even an insider may possess features of *alterity* that reflect his constant change and development.

The category of *alterity* has its own language manifestations. In some languages there are explicit as well as implicit ways of rendering the categorical meaning of *alterity*, such as contextual negotiation of meaning, cues and inferences.

To categorize the quantity of language means, denoting *alterity* in both Russian and English, it is relevant to follow the parametrical representation of the category, which was mentioned above. The

most common linguistic manifestations of *alterity* in Russian are presented in Table below, which sums up the lexical-and-semantic study within the scope of Russian and English dictionaries (Alexandrova, 2001; Abramov, 1999; Baranov, 1995; Ideograficheskiy slovar...; Kuzmin, Shadrin, 1996; Kunin, 1984; Evgeneva (ed.), 2001; Tolkovyy slovar russkogo yazyka kontsa XX v..., 1998; Shadrin, 2003; LDCE; OALD; OALDCE; OCD; ODEI; ODSA; OLT; OPT).

Categorical parameters of *alterity* and their specifiers

Parameters of <i>alterity</i>	Specifiers of <i>alterity</i>
1) singularity – plurality	English linguistic means: <i>another, different, other, the other, heterogeneous, assorted, mixed, miscellaneous, multifarious, varied, sundry, various, etc.</i> Russian linguistic means: <i>другой, другие, некоторые люди, прочий, прочие, отдельные люди, остальные, остальной, оставшиеся, каждый, иной, иные, другого рода, всякий, всякие, всяческий, всевозможный, частный, частичный, разнообразный, многообразный и пр.</i>
2) identity – non-identity	English linguistic means: <i>another, alter ego, other, the other, resembling, the likes of me/us, similar, etc.</i> Russian linguistic means: <i>другой, другие, не этот, не тот, иной, иные, видоизмененный, второй, не такой, схожий, сходный, подобный, наподобие и пр.</i>
3) similarity – difference	English linguistic means: <i>differential, clashing, contradictory, conflicting, deviating, contrasting, discordant, developing, disparate, discrepant, dissimilar, distinct, ill-matched, distinguishable, diverse, divergent, incongruous, incompatible, modified, varying, inconsistent, opposed, controversial, opposite, etc.</i> Russian linguistic means: <i>другой, разный, отличный, непохожий, обратный, противоположный, несхожий, несходный, диаметральный, противоположащий, супротивный, различный, особенный, особый, неодинаковый, отличающийся, противоречивый, дифференциальный и пр.</i>
4) normality – abnormality	English linguistic means: <i>altered, abnormal, atypical, anomalous, changed, bizarre, distinctive, distinct, extraordinary, eccentric, individual, fresh, original, irregular, peculiar, particular, personal, separate, revolutionary, special, singular, strange, specific, uncommon, unique, unorthodox, unconventional, dissonant, unusual, etc.</i> Russian linguistic means: <i>другой, непривычный, необычный, в диковинку, забавный, смешной, выдающийся, исключительный, уединенный, индивидуальный, единичный, розничный, нехарактерный, странный, особый, спорадический, партикулярный, нехарактерный, несвойственный, чрезвычайный, дикий, непонятный, удивительный, необычайный, необыкновенный, нелепый, чудной, чудный, неестественный, ненормальный, оригинальный, отстраненный, экзотический, противоестественный, диковинный, вычурный, неординарный, экстраординарный, эксцентричный, парадоксальный, самобытный, странноватый, чудаческий, чудаковатый и пр.</i>
5) nativity – strangeness	English linguistic means: <i>outsider, separated, distant, dissimilar, disagreeable, divarified, unequal, divided, discriminating, disunified, alien, split, foreign, extra-terrestrial, outlandish, faraway, unfamiliar, remote, imported, external, overseas, dissent, uncharacteristic, etc.</i> Russian linguistic means: <i>незнакомый, неизвестный, далекий, иностранный, посторонний, чужеземный, иноземный, приезжий, чужой, чуждый, отдаленный, варяг, зарубежный, заграничный, экзотический, сторонний, отрешенный, нездешний, заморский, непричастный, отчужденный, внешний, экзотичный, варяжский, неродной, чужестранный, пригульный, проходящий, не свой, новоприбывший, новоявленный, особняком, одинокий и пр.</i>
6) definiteness – indefiniteness	English linguistic means: <i>inconsistent, erroneous, incongruous, alterable, vague, bias, ambiguous, changeable, disputable, dubious, new, distorted, etc.</i> Russian linguistic means: <i>какой-то, какой-нибудь, некоторый, некоторые, кто-то другой, кое-кто, кто-либо другой, новый, кто-нибудь другой, свежий, новоизбранный, малоизвестный и пр.</i>
7) reality – unreality	English linguistic means: <i>alternative, far-fetched, possible, deplorable, variant, optional, etc.</i> Russian linguistic means: <i>альтернативный, вероятный, возможный, предполагаемый, мыслимый, допустимый, правдоподобный, неестественный, энный, нереальный, надуманный, выдуманный и пр.</i>

Resuming the data derived from the examples, it should be noted that both the languages display similar tendencies in conceptualizing *alterity*. There are common meanings in Russian and English, such as:

1) “unlikeness, absence of similarity” (*different, clashing, conflicting, differential, disparate, dissimilar, divergent, diverse, inconsistent, unlike* – *непохожий, не такой, несходный, отличный, другого рода, несхожий*);

2) “variety, belonging to different groups” (*multifarious, assorted, heterogeneous, ill-matched, miscellaneous, mixed, sundry, varied, various* – *другой, не тот, не этот*);

3) “firm opposition / contradiction” (*opposed, opposite, contradictory, contrasting, incompatible* – *противоположный, противный, супротивный, обратный*).

However, apart from the common semantic characteristics the English language obviously differs from Russian in terms of conceptual subtleties of the notion *alterity*. First of all, the English language representation of the category is strongly associated with disharmony, norm-violation (*deviating, discordant, abnormal, atypical, incongruous*). Another difference lies in interpreting *alterity* as strange, unusual and incomprehensible (*anomalous, bizarre, strange, uncommon, unconventional, unorthodox, unusual*). Moreover, the English language means focus on the idea of brightness, originality and eccentricity (*particular, peculiar, personal, singular, special, specific, unique, distinguishable, distinct, distinctive, eccentric, extraordinary, individual, irregular, original*). Furthermore, *alterity* for the English-speaking individual is something new, whereas the Russian perception does not make it explicit. Also it is of great scientific interest to admit the metaphorical rendering of *alterity* as something revolutionary and fresh. To crown it all, the category of *alterity* can be verbalized with the help of English lexemes *altered* and *changed*.

In contrast to English, the category of *alterity* in the Russian language is semantically less constituent, as most categorical meanings discovered in English can be expressed in Russian owing to polysemantic forms that cover the notion of *alterity*. In particular, it is worth mentioning that the Russian polysemantic determiner “не та-

кой” has the meaning of “strange” (e.g. “Он не такой, как все”, “Он какой-то не такой”). Judging by the generalizing nature of the Russian language means it can be deduced that the category of *alterity* is more abstract in the Russian language in comparison with English where it is more specified. The word *otherness* itself that nominates the basic notion of the category in English is a dual notion: the quality of being strange or different (LDCE) unlike the Russian term *ина-кость*, which puts forth plentiful interpretations and designations of *alterity*.

Alterity as a linguistic category may express an outlook on the reality (similar, i.e. familiar, devoid of risk: other, different, vague, evidently evoking fear or curiosity). Taking into account the fact that a person’s opinion is necessarily evaluative, the category of *alterity* should be viewed as evaluative as well. In the Russian language it is linked to the emotional clusters of curiosity, fear, suspense, fun and incongruity, whereas in the English language it is associated with curiosity, admiration, surprise and novice.

Alterity via communicative strategies and tactics

As well as through the linguistic means, presented in this article, the category of *alterity* may be manifested through the choice of communicative strategies and tactics, relevant for a concrete communicative situation.

Judging by the variety of contexts studied (345 contexts), every level of the manifestation of *alterity* (in self-identity, interpersonal, social and intercultural communication) is characterized by confirmative and disfirmative strategies [Matyash, 2011], used to accept or abject the Other as a significant interactor. Confirmation is based on non-conflicting, non-imposing and glorifying prescriptions [Sternin, 2004; Takhtarova, 2017], followed by focus on cooperative communication (ecological), mitigation and face-saving of interlocutors. Respectively, disfirmation takes place in conscious or subconscious violations of these prescriptions. In this case interlocutors deal with Self-centred opinions, while in confirmative acts communication is Other-centred.

The following passage from Ian McEwan’s novel *Atonement* can be viewed as an example of confirmative communication:

(2) Henri Bonnet said, ‘All that fighting we did twenty-five years ago. All those dead. Now the Germans back in France. In two days they’ll be here, taking everything we have. Who would have believed it?’

Turner felt, for the first time, the full ignominy of the retreat. He was ashamed. He said, with even less conviction than before, ‘We’ll be back to throw them out, I promise you.’ (McEwan, 2007, p. 200).

It is known from the macrocontext of the novel that the quoted conversation takes place between British soldiers and French peasants, the chronotope being France in the times of World War II. The microcontext of the passage renders emotional contemplation of the British troops’ retreat at Dunkirk, which is verbalized as *felt... the full ignominy, he was ashamed*. Despite unequal status of the interlocutors as well as their belonging to different cultures, their communication is channeled in a friendly tone, owing to a great degree to the interpretational skills of the main character Turner and his empathy towards the problematic issues experienced by the Others. Turner does not refuse to make a remark in an awkward situation, in which he has to admit the failure of his army as if it were his own: being far from certain about the British troops’ return to the territory of France with the aim to free it, he still prefers to express sympathy and support, promising to come back.

Despite being doomed, the French peasants are welcoming, friendly and respectful in their communicative manner: they avoid saying negative things about the British army retreat and bitterly state the inescapable future. They break their last bread with the British soldiers, who are about to abandon the country occupied by Germans. Thus, the situation described demonstrates an active exchange of communicative roles, remark steps, based on the leading strategy of both the British soldiers and the French peasants. As a result, the degree of the communication activity in this context is characterized as high: their perception of their own role in this discourse, their own contribution to the communication, self-attitude and attitude to the Other are means of the common communicative aim – to support each other in a hopeless situation.

It should be noted that variability of *alterity* produces a definite pragmatic effect. In keeping with the example of imperial Britain, the literature

of that time period reflected the general policy of perceiving the other in the light of their weakness and inferiority, thus extenuating the moral responsibility of the stronger self to educate, convert, or civilize depending on the identity of the other. In this respect *othering* can be done with any racial, ethnic, religious, or geographically-defined category of people. A number of S.W. Maugham’s (*Rain*) and M. Spark’s (*The Black Madonna*) novellas exemplify this point.

On balance, “contemporary British fiction is keen to explore the cultural representation of geographical spaces, especially in relation to the urban environment and national identity” while “postmodernism and postcolonialism in fiction have both served to loosen traditional discourses of Englishness” [Bentley, 2008, p. 189]. One of the ways to approach the phenomenon of *alterity* as it is reflected in fiction is to address the postwar literature, which is associated with a deep interest in immigrants and exiles [May, 2010]. The problem of immigrants and national identity has been raised on a wider scale than ever before. To a certain degree it is touched upon in such novels as *Magpie* by Jill Dawson, *Nice Work* by David Lodge, *The History of the World in 10 ½ chapters* by Julian Barnes, *White Teeth* by Zadie Smith, which is in itself considered to be a multi-cultural novel [May, 2010].

In these novels racial and ethnical *alterity* is rendered in the form of identity clusters, in which some characters are apt to retain their cultural and national peculiarities, not willing to develop any features of sameness by means of mimesis. For example, such characters can be observed in *Magpie* (Josh and some other neighbours in the Flanders estate). Others might seem dissatisfied with their ethnical or religious background and seek ways of fitting into the society they have found themselves in.

*Alterity as a factor
in the ecological/non-ecological mode
of communication*

Overlapping the sphere of the Other entails dealing with a person’s emotional sphere and defines the ecological mode of communicative situations, representing the category of *alterity*. Ecological communication in the most general

sense is viewed as the kind of communication that does not harm the life and health of a person [Shakhovsky, 2021]. According to our data analysis, the formation of the ecological/non-ecological mode of communication is influenced by the role of the Other and is relevant in regard to the construction of the image of the Other.

As an example of co-tuning in communication, which may be successful (ecological) or unsuccessful (non-ecological), is the following literary context:

(3) A word, a look, a smile, a frown, did something to another human being, waking response or aversion, and a web was woven which had no beginning and no end, spreading outward and inward too, merging, entangling, so that the struggle of one depended upon the struggle of the other (Daphne du Maurier).

The context under discussion represents a case of explicit emotivity as well as emotional evaluation in equalizing One and the Other. The Other is considered as an indispensable quality of any relation, since the extended metaphor about a web that describes the whole continuum of people's relations, denotes the utmost necessity and inalienability of the Other in the matter of Self-construing, the development and growth/regress of the I of a person and his/her boundaries.

The main character of the novel *The Scapgoat* makes use of such strategies and tactics as emotional balancing, conflict depreciation, emotional tolerance as well as decreasing communicative aggression, which all add up to the markers of ecological communication [Ionova, 2019]. The character appears to be able to break his sister's (Blanche) 15-year-long silence caused by the anger and detestment on Blanche's part due to the fact that he murdered her fiancé during World War II. The new Jean lessens the conflict by means of his sincere confession and repentance:

(4) I had never looked at those photographs before. I realized, turning the pages, that he was good, and that the workmen must have loved and respected him. It came to me that when he was killed it was through jealousy; the man who shot him, or ordered him to be shot, did it not from mistaken patriotism but because he envied him, because Maurice Duval was finer than he was himself (Daphne du Maurier).

The quoted passage dwells on Jean's admittance that he was envious and jealous of his

sister's loved one, because he was kinder and more open-hearted to his nearest. He confirms his being a murderer as well and at the verbal level it is rendered through a number of pejorative words and phrases: *killed, through jealousy, mistaken patriotism, envied him*.

Furthermore, the main character makes use of such tactics as splitting his own 'I', self-denial, transformation into a new image by means of empathy. He turns into a *homo ludens* but he is a *homo sentiens* at the same time, who puts on a new image depending on the circumstances he finds himself in. It all brings out the best qualities in his human nature and becomes the reason for pacifying the nearly belligerent atmosphere in the chateau. For example, in his talk to the mother the main character shows interest in the needs of his interlocutor, not his own. He irons the old conflict and disagreements that have been a matter of discretion in the family.

The emotional energy, that fosters John's verbal communication, has a positive impact on the interlocutors – the inhabitants of the chateau, although they are not willing to construct any common emotional centre with him. This fact justifies the idea that even efforts of one communicator may have an ecological effect in any emotional situations. This ever-changing process is grounded on the human nature, which can be dominant, by either its ecological or non-ecological quality.

Conclusion

As revealed in the study, the category of *alterity* can be viewed as a parameter of the communicative process that predetermines realization of communicative strategies and tactics as well as the structure of the communicative situation which ultimately results in effective (cooperative, ecological)/non-effective (destructive, non-ecological) communication.

The linguistic study of *alterity* evolves our understanding of the association of language with the person's sense of self, of the complex relationship between language and cultural identity, thus the research undertaken represents theoretically important and relevant results for such branches of science as theory of communication, general and applied linguistics. It has been pointed out that the category of *alterity* is culturally specific

in different languages, preserving the same core components of the meaning. The linguistic peculiarities reflecting specific cultural interpretations are taken as complementary notions that construct the complex category of *alterity* and that serve as its main semantic parameters.

One of the significant conclusions for theory and practice of communication is the fact that *alterity*, brought out as a dominant category in any kind of human relations, turns into a factor decreasing the quality of life, leading to unsuccessfulness and dissatisfaction and resulting in non-ecological impacts on a person's health. On the other hand, employing cooperative strategies on behalf of at least one of the interlocutors can have an ecological effect in many emotional situations.

To recapitulate, the main properties of *alterity* as a complex multifold communication category are the ones of being implicit, parametrical, variable and situational. Depending on the level of awareness of the category's significant content, interlocutors are capable/incapable of regulating communicative interaction (the choice of certain language means, use of discursive markers and communicative strategies and tactics). On top of that, effective and ecologically relevant communication is possible on condition of constructing the image of the Other that must be adequate to the communicative situation. It presupposes developing a special competence – linguoallological (from allology – a science about the Other) that forms the perspective of our research.

REFERENCES

- Bentley N., 2008. *Contemporary British Fiction: Edinburgh Critical Guides*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press. 245 p.
- Dorogavtseva I.S., 2009. Lingvisticheskiy aspekt otnosheniya Ya / Drugoj v filosofii XX veka [Linguistic Aspect of the I / Other Relationship in the Philosophy of the 20th Century]. *Gumanitarnyy vector* [Humanitarian Vector], no. 3, pp. 87-90.
- Hogrebe W., 1993. Die epistemische Bedeutung des Fremden. Wierlacher A., Hrsg. *Kulturthema Fremdheit. Leitbegriffe und Problemfelder kulturwissenschaftlicher Fremdenforschung*. Muenchen, Iudicium, S. 355-370.
- Hymes D.H., 1974. *Studies in the History of Linguistics: Traditions and Paradigms*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press. 519 p.
- Ionova S.V., 2019. Lingvistika emocij – nauka budushchego [Linguistics of Emotions – the Science of the Future]. *Izvestiya Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* [Izvestia of the Volgograd State Pedagogical University], vol. 134, no. 1, pp. 124-131.
- Kislyakova E.Y., 2018. Inakost kak kommunikativnaya kategoriya [Alterity as a Communicative Category]. *Mir lingvistiki i kommunikatsii: elektron. nauch. zhurn.* [World of Linguistics and Communication. Electronic Scientific Journal], no. 1, pp. 105-121. URL: www.tverlingua.ru
- Kislyakova E.Y., Madzhaeva S.I., 2021. *Inakost kak parametr kommunikativnogo vzaimodeistviya* [Alterity as a Parameter of Communication]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Moscow Region State University], no. 3, pp. 210-220.
- Kramsch C., 1998. *Language and Culture*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. 134 p.
- Kubryakova E.S., 2004. *Yazyk i znanie: Na puti polucheniya znaniy o yazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoy tochki zreniya. Rol yazyka v poznanii mira* [Language and Knowledge: On the Way to Gaining Knowledge About Language: Parts of Speech from a Cognitive Point of View. The Role of Language in the Knowledge of the World]. Moscow, Yaz. slav. kultury Publ. 560 p.
- Langacker R.W., 1999. The Contextual Basis of Cognitive Semantics. Nuyts J., Peterson E., eds. *Language and Conceptualization*. London, Cambridge Univ. Press, pp. 229-252.
- Levinas E., 1999. *Alterity and Transcendence*. New York, Columbia University Press. 195 p.
- Matyash O., 2011. Yazyk v mezhlichnostnoy kommunikatsii [The Language in Interpersonal Communication]. *Mezhlichnostnaya kommunikatsiya: teoriya i zhizn* [Interpersonal Communication: Theory and Practice]. Saint Petersburg, Rech Publ., pp. 211-273.
- May W., 2010. On the Multi-Cultural Novel, Zadie Smith, and Literary Origin. *Footpath: A Journal of Contemporary British Literature in Russian Universities*, no. 3. (Jan.-June). Perm, Perm State University, pp. 18-24.
- Semenova T.I., 2009. Modus kazhimosti: mezhdu istinoy i lozhyu [Modus of Seemingness: Between Truth and Lies]. *Vestnik Irkutskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta* [Science Journal of Irkutsk State Linguistic University], no. 3, pp. 6-12.
- Shakhovskiy V.I., 2019a. Obosnovanie lingvisticheskoy teorii emotsiy [Grounding the Linguistic Theory

- of Emotions]. *Voprosy psikholingvistiki* [Journal of Psycholinguistics], vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 22-37.
- Shakhovskiy V.I., 2019b. Emotsionalnaya kartina mira v verbalnoy prezentatsii [Emotional Worldview in Verbal Manifestation]. *Mir russkogo slova* [The World of Russian Word], no. 1, pp. 35-43.
- Shakhovskiy V.I., 2021. Ekologiya kommunikativnoy distributsii slova [The Ecology of the Communicative Distribution of the Word]. *Neofilologiya* [Neophilology], vol. 7, no. 27, pp. 369-376.
- Sternin, I.A., 2004. O ponyatii kommunikativnogo soznaniya i nekotorykh osobennostyakh russkogo kommunikativnogo soznaniya [On the Notion of the Communicative Consciousness and Some Peculiarities of the Russian Communicative Consciousness]. *Yazykovoe soznanie: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty* [The Linguistic Consciousness and Applied Aspect]. Moscow, Barnaul, Izd-vo Altayskogo un-ta, pp. 36-63.
- Takhtarova S.S., 2017. Kommunikativniye kategorii v kognitivno-diskursivnoy paradigme [Communicative Categories in the Cognitive-Discursive Paradigm]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 189-196. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2017.2.21>
- Vezhbitskaya A., 2001. *Ponimanie kultur cherez posredstvo klyuchevykh slov* [Understanding Cultures Through the Medium of Keywords]. Moscow, Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury Publ. 288 p.
- of the Russian Language. Practical Reference]. Moscow, Rus. yaz. Publ., 2001. 564 p.
- Baranov O.S. *Ideograficheskiy slovar russkogo yazyka* [Thesaurus Dictionary of the Russian Language]. Moscow, Izd-vo ETS, 1995. URL: <http://ideographic.academic.ru/>
- Ideograficheskiy slovar russkogo yazyka* [Thesaurus Dictionary of the Russian Language]. URL: <http://ideographic.academic.ru>
- Kuzmin S.S., Shadrin N.L. *Russko-angliyskiy slovar poslovits i pogovorok* [Russian-English Dictionary of Proverbs and Sayings]. Saint Petersburg, MIK / Lan Publ., 1996. 352 p.
- Kunin A.V. *Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar* [English-Russian Dictionary of Idioms]. Moscow, Rus. yaz. Publ., 1984. 944 p.
- Evgeneva A.P., ed. *Slovar sinonimov russkogo yazyka. V 2 t. T. 2* [Dictionary of Synonyms of the Russian Language. In 2 Vols. Vol. 2]. Moscow, Astrel Publ., AST Publ., 2001. 681 p.
- Tolkovyy slovar russkogo yazyka kontsa XX v.: (Yazykovye izmeneniya)* [Definition Dictionary of the Russian Language of the End of the 20th Century. Language Changes]. Saint Petersburg, Folio-press Publ., 1998. 700 p.
- Shadrin N.L. *Russko-angliyskiy slovar ustoychivyykh sravneniy* [Russian-English Dictionary of Set Comparisons]. Saint Petersburg, Zolotoy vek Publ., 2003. 528 p.
- LDCE – *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. The Complete Guide to Written and Spoken English*. Harlow, Longman House, 1995. 1668 p.
- OALD – *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005. 1780 p.
- OALDCE – *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000. 1820 p.
- OCD – *Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002. 897 p.
- ODEI – Cowie A.P., Mackin R., McCaig I.R. *Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993. 685 p.
- ODSA – Spooner A., ed. *Oxford Dictionary of Synonyms and Antonyms*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005. 572 p.
- OLT – *Oxford Learner's Thesaurus. A Dictionary of Synonyms*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008. 1008 p.
- OPT – Kirkpatrick B., ed. *Oxford Paperback Thesaurus*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000. 909 p.

SOURCES

- Du Maurier D. *Scapegoat*. URL: https://www.bookfrom.net/daphne-du-maurier/31817-the_scapegoat.html
- Lodge D. *Small World*. S.I., Penguin Books, 1984. 340 p.
- McEwan I. *Atonement*. London, Vintage books, 2007. 372 p.

DICTIONARIES

- Abramov N. *Slovar russkikh sinonimov i skhodnykh po smyslu vyrazheniy* [Dictionary of Russian Synonyms and Similar Expressions]. Moscow, Russkie slovari Publ., 1999. 665 p.
- Aleksandrova Z.E. *Slovar sinonimov russkogo yazyka: prakt. sprav.* [Dictionary of Synonyms

Information About the Authors

Evgenia Y. Kislyakova, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Department of English Language and Methods of Its Teaching, Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Prosp. im. V.I. Lenina, 27, 400005 Volgograd, Russia, kisjen@rambler.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6425-9829>

Sergey Grinev-Grinevich, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Faculty of Humanities and Economics (Department of English-Russian Philology), State Higher Professional School after Edward Shchepanik in Suwalki, Theophil Nonevich St, 10, 16-400 Suwalki, Poland, svgrinev1@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8393-915X>

Elvira A. Sorokina, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Department of English Philology, Moscow Region State Pedagogical University, Very Voloshinoy St, 24, 141014 Mytishchi, Russia; Professor, Department of Linguistics, Russian University of Transport, Obraztsova St, 9, 127994 Moscow, GSP-4, Russia, ellazor@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4965-078X>

Sanya I. Madzhaeva, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of Latin and Foreign Languages, Astrakhan State Medical University, Bakinskaya St, 121, 414000 Astrakhan, Russia, sanya-madzhaeva@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8478-9616>

Информация об авторах

Евгения Юрьевна Кислякова, доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры английского языка и методики его преподавания, Волгоградский государственный социально-педагогический университет, просп. им. В.И. Ленина, 27, 400005 г. Волгоград, Россия, kisjen@rambler.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6425-9829>

Сергей Гринев-Гринеvич, доктор филологических наук, профессор гуманитарно-экономического факультета (направление «Англо-русская филология»), Государственная высшая профессиональная школа им. Эдварда Щепаника в Сувалках, ул. Теофиля Ноневича, 10, 16-400 г. Сувалки, Польша, svgrinev1@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8393-915X>

Эльвира Анатольевна Сорокина, доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры английской филологии, Московский государственный областной педагогический университет, ул. Веры Волошиной, 24, 141014 г. Мытищи, Россия; профессор кафедры лингвистики, Российский университет транспорта, ул. Образцова, 9, 127994 г. Москва, ГСП-4, Россия, ellazor@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4965-078X>

Санья Ибрагимовна Маджаева, доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой латинского и иностранных языков, Астраханский государственный медицинский университет, ул. Бакинская, 121, 414000 г. Астрахань, Россия, sanya-madzhaeva@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8478-9616>