© EKATERINA V. AVERYANOVA

septurion@rambler.ru

PRESCRIPTION AND PROHIBITION AS MANIPULATIVE CATEGORIES

SUMMARY. In this article the inclusion of such categories as prescription and prohibition into the class of manipulative categories of religious discourse is being substantiated. Means of expressing these categories are also described.

KEY WORDS. Manipulation, religious discourse, prescription, prohibition, deontic modality.

This article is devoted to the justification of bringing the categories of "prescription" and "prohibition" into the class of manipulative categories.

The founder of Paris school of semiotics A.-J. Greimas considered only 4 manipulative categories: temptation and deterrence in the modality scope of **to be able to;** seduction and provocation in the modality scope of **to know**.

Basing on the modality **to be able to**, the manipulator suggests the manipulated positive (temptation) or negative values (deterrence) acting in the pragmatic dimension. In the cognitive dimension he voices a positive judgement (seduction) or a negative judgement (provocation) about the manipulated addressee, estimating his competence necessary for the fulfillment of some act. Alongside with the above mentioned, the author does not include such elements of the deontic category of modality (the modality **to be able to**) as prescription and prohibition into the manipulative categories. Apparently, this is due to the status of the modality "to owe" in French semiotics. Consider the table [ibid.; 231]:

Table 1

modalities	virtualized	actualizing	realized
exotaxic	to owe	to be able to	to do
endotaxic	to want	to know	to be

The modalities **to be able to** and **to know** are referred to the actualizing ones by A.-J. Greimas and on this ground they have received the manipulative status. It is necessary to explain that 3 types of semiotic existence came to be differentiated after N. Khomski: the virtual, the actual and the realized one. The Subject becomes one if it seeks (wants) the Object, then both the Subject and the Object are actualized and are in disjunction but when the Subject receives the Object both of them are realized. The subject is a virtual Subject until the actualization of an Object lack takes place which is the stage of virtualization.

According to A.-J. Greimas, the syntagmatic way can be directed by the hierarchy of the following modalities:

To want → to know → to be able to ⇒ to do

The modal value of **to know** without the category of **to be** is not enough for action but the category **to know** is not compulsory for acquiring of the category **to be able to** which means that knowledge is optional [3; 179-180]. The author produces the hierarchy of Subjects on this ground: "knowing" Subjects (Hop-o'-my-thumb) and "powerful" Subjects (Man-eater).

A.-J. Greimas's follower J.Cl. Coquet took the liberty to object his teacher which had lead to their rupture: he suggested the "transformational history of the doer" for the purpose of identifying its personality [2; 69]:

To want → to know → to be able to => to do

To know → to be able to → to want => to do [ibid.; 87-93].

The first way is typical of the Subject-seeker implementing the program of acquiring the Object for the purpose of identifying its personality. The second way +refers to the legal Subject basing on the established fulfills the program of attaining the Object with the purpose of revealing (its ability (to be able to), ruled by the knowledge. For example, "a teacher" is a legal Subject and the "creator" — "the Subject-seeker" [ibid.].

Note that the category of debt is presupposed by both authors in the paradigmatic scope and is ignored by both in the syntagmatic scope. It is assumed that there might be the third syntagmatic way:

To know → to be able to → to owe => to do.

This way, in our opinion, it is inherent for **the Subject of debt.** In the analyzed texts of Old Russian lives in Church Slavic language of the XVI-XVII centuries the Subject having acquired the holy order of father Superior or of the bishop made a monk is addressed with a speech containing the direction and more rarely the prohibition. We came to the conclusion that the modality of owe is not virtualizing as it presupposes already formed competence of the Subject (**to know** and **to be able to**). The immanent Sender does not address a random individual but the Subject whose competence is necessary and enough for an action fulfillment. The question remaining is: "Which Object does the Subject of debt want in this case?" In case of temptation and deterrence it acquires a positive or a negative Object and in case of seducement and provocation it wants to be in conjunction with such a value as honor whereas in prescription and prohibition it also conjugates with this positive value because in the end of the way after the fulfillment of the contract a positive sanction (recognition) is waiting for it which is judgment of the final Sender about the completed narrative program and the debt Subject's status.

By virtue of the above mentioned, we differentiate the modalities of **to want** and **to owe**: if the Subject-seeker does not have the necessary competence and acquires it before action's accomplishment then the Subject of owe does not any longer have the necessary competence for the fulfillment of an action acknowledged by the Sender that is from the outside on the society level.

That is the reason why we consider the modality "**to owe**" as an actualizing one:

Table 2

modalities	virtualized	actualized	realized
exotaxic		to be able to	to do
		to owe	
endotaxic	to want	to know	to be

Therefore, having accepted the modality of owe as an actualizing category, we have grounds for including prescription and prohibition in the contents of manipulative categories.

A.-J. Greimas specifies that deontic modalities touch upon the modal competence of The Subject and they are not referred to the universe of the Sender which does not prescribe a certain action [4; 90]. It is necessary to object that basing on our material we have revealed only prescriptions and prohibitions of certain actions.

In church Slavic religious discourse prevail such types of manipulation as temptation (430 examples), seduction (336 examples), deterrence is more rarely used (149 examples), even more rarely prescription (59 examples), then comes provocation (30 examples) and prohibition (11 examples).

In our material the category of prescription is realized mainly with the help of the impersonal verb in the 3rd person пѫдоѣаст: Address to the second person singular or plural in the dative case prevail (16 examples), for example:

въ единѫ же ѿ ноцieн молѧцiѧсѧ свѧтомѫ въ ѡбычнѡм своєм правилѣ, в сѫн тонок сведенъ быс. зрит нѣкоего юношѫ красна ѕѣло глаголюща пѫдоѣает ти иноу церквь болша сiа съзгдати. понеже братiн твоен множащнся. н iако имѣти имашн застѫпницю н помоцiницю прчстѫю ѡныне н до вѣка (Житие Дионисия Глушицкого. С. 10).

As we can notice the transcendental Sender in the face of the angel addresses the Subject (Father Superior) with the prescription of a specific action. Deontic modality is realized with the help of the predicate "befit to" having the meaning of necessity which rules the infinitive.

This verb is also spread in case of addressing in the 1st person plural нам (14 examples):

...подоѣает нам братïе оускым н прискѡрѣным поутем шествовати (Житие Антония Сийского. С. 37).

Here the immanent Sender (Father Superior) addresses the collective Subject (brethren) using the deontic modality with the predicate showing necessity.

The presence of the generalizing prescription should also be noticed (5 examples):

...писано, братне, в ѣожественном писанïн: ко всякому люѣящему Бога н чяющих воздания ѣудущыхъ ѣлагъ подоѣает съ радующимнся радоватнся н с плачющими плакати (Свт. Макарий. Великие Минеи Четии. Сент. Вып. 1. С. 484).

In this case the transcendent Sender (God) addresses the collective Subject including everyone who is endowed with qualities expressed by the present tense participles.

The cases when the impersonal verb достонт, the short adjectives должно, лепо and the noun потреѣа were used in the role of modalizing predicates of necessity. In syntactic terms these short adjectives and the noun act as predicative adverbs. As has been stated in "The Russian grammar" in such sentences the predicative adverb is a grammatical basis of a sentence [1; 378]. The short adjectives должно, лепо and the noun потреѣа can be named both: subject and subjectless conditions [ibid.].

Let us consider the implementation of the category of "prohibition". The verb подоѣает in the negative form is most frequently used in the role of a modalizing predicate (6 examples):

... т҃ѣмже братїн, доволны бꙋдемъ оꙋставленною однждою нашею, н пнцею предложенною на трапеꙃе, в къ келлїн же ѿ снцевыҳ ннчтоже нмѣтн подобаетъ.. (Свт. Димитрий Ростовский. Жития святых в 4 кн. Кн. III. С. 727).

The immanent Sender (Father Superior) here exhorts the brethren (the collective Subject) to adhere to the requirements of monastic regulation of the communal life.

Consider the usage of the verb **запрещать** in two cases:

н осоѣнаг стѧжанїа ѿнꙋд не нмѣнте ннчтож. такожде н пнтїа пїанственаго, молю вы н ꙃапрѣщаю.. (Житие Павла Обнорского. С. 31).

The short adjective (**нѣсть**) **лѣпо** and the impersonal verb **не достонт** were also found used in the role of the predicate of necessity.

Thus we have given proofs for substantiation of including the categories of "prescription" and "prohibition" into the manipulative class on the grounds that the Subject having an already formed competence is addressed with prescription and prohibition in the Church Slavic religious discourse.

The most prevailing way of expressing both categories is the impersonal verb in the 3rd person singular (**не**) **подобает** implementing the role of a modalizing predicate of necessity.

REFERENCES

1. Greimas, A.J., Courtés, J. Sémiotique. Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage. P.: Hachette Supérieur, (1979) 1993. 454 p.

2. Greimas, A.J. Du sens. P.: Seuil, 1970. 317 p.

3. Coquet, J.Cl. Le discours et son sujet. Vol. I. P.: Klincksieck, 1984. 222 p.

4. Russian Grammar.Vol. II. Syntax. Moscow: Nauka, 1980. 709 p.

A LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1. The Life of Antoniy Siyskiy // S.Petersburg Corpus of Hagiographic Texts. URL: http://project.phil.spbu.ru/scat/page.php?page=list.

2. The Life of Dionisius Glushitsiy // S.Petersburg Corpus of Hagiographic Texts. URL: http://project.phil.spbu.ru/scat/page.php?page=list.

3. The Life of Pavel Obnorskiy // S.Petersburg Corpus of Hagiographic Texts URL: http://project.phil.spbu.ru/scat/page.php?page=list.

4. Saint Dmitriy Rostovskiy. Saints' Lives in 4 Volumes. The Kiev-Pecherskaya Laura, 1764. // Saint Dmitriy Rostovskiy (1651-1709). S.Petersburg, 2009. 1 CD-ROM. Patristic Heritage > Вып. 2.

5. Saint Makariy. The Greatness of Minea Chetia // Saint Makariy Mocow and All-Russia Bishop (1482-1563). S.Petersburg, 2009. 1 CD-ROM. Patristic Heritage. > Вып. 1.