1. Introduction

All members of society are united by certain relationships and connections, the most persistent of which are family ones – those, in which the social instinct of man begins to be realized. Family as one of the standard elements of the environment gaining the most meaningful and emotional value as a result of the historical and cultural development, became one of the symbols of the human consciousness, which causes permanent relevance of studies of family discourse (FD).

Semiotic space of FD, as an object of the study, includes verbal signs (lexical ones nominating people, objects and events, precedent expressions, texts, genres, situations) and non-verbal ones (kisses, hugs, wedding rings, monograms, photographs, family estates, inheritance artifacts) filled with special meaning. They implement an idea of typical patterns of behavior in the family sphere being a special category for everyone and are included into the core of consciousness becoming its symbol. Thus, we determine the disclosure of linguistic symbols of "attachment to family" (as a subject of research), "using facts of conscious speech to identify unconscious rules of knowledge arrangement in their base" [1] as the main objective of the study.

Symbolic perception as a subtype of the intellectual one (as opposed to [2] or is a kind of intuitive [3]) is simultaneously a discursive perception that deals with symbolized ideas. In other words, discursive thinking operates with symbols [4]. FD as a discursive practice that involves communication between family members on the basis of certain stereotyped model of world vision determines the set of social characters – certain units, the main function of which is to provide experience, while their use provides the group identity, because "symbols simultaneously preserve both the general and individual point of view" [5]. Taking into account the above mentioned we can assume that the specificity of FD semiotics is primarily determined by the symbolism of the language system elements.

In the general consciousness of an adult and a child on the domestic level (as opposed to the rational one) it is the symbol that dominates [6]. A child thinking in complexes and an adult thinking in concepts reach understanding in FD, because their thinking "is actually represented by complex concepts that coincide" [7], i. e. is primarily symbolic. Developing a symbolic activity in the game, the child manipulates objects-substitutes and simulates imaginary action steps of an imaginary person.

Family images as archetype [8] and culturally socialized symbols [9], are, on the one hand, the "messengers" of ancient times, and, on the other hand, correlating with contemporary cultural context, are transformed under its influence [10]. Main

THE ANALYSIS OF SEMIOTICS OF THE FAMILY LANGUAGE AS A VERBALIZED AREA OF FAMILY DISCOURSE

Iryna Osovska
Doctor of Philology, Full Professor
Department of German, General and Comparative Linguistics
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
Kotsubynski str., 2, Chernivtsi, Ukraine, 58012
germmova@rambler.ru

Abstract: The article deals with the discursive symbolism of elements of the language system which determines the specificity of family discourse semiotics. The symbolism of the „family" sign is predetermined by the case-interpretation. Family language is a set of secondary symbols created by a group and associated with emotional rituals. Integration of family language sign in the area of their functioning – family discourse – is based on the mutual determinism. From the perspective of Charles Peirce's theory of sign (classifying into three main trychotomies – the sign by itself, the meaning of the sign and its syntagmatic functioning in interaction with others), the research shows the whole complex of characteristics of semiotic entities in intra-familial nominations. The article proves that the "family" precedent is based on the experience within a collective cognitive space – common (recognizable, used and cited by other members of the group – family) memories that determine the identity of a man as a representative of the family recognizing its values, norms, ideas, priorities, tastes and traditions. Family images as archetype and culturally socialized symbols, are the "messengers" of ancient times, and, correlating with contemporary cultural context, are transformed under its influence. The family discourse symbolic meanings are genuinely represented by a set of specific nominative acts.

Keywords: discourse, family discourse, family idiolect, symbol, symbolism, precedency, ritual, semiotic.

discourse-forming dominants of FD (mother, father, brother, sister, wife, husband, daughter, son), the initial integrating characteristics of which is the symbolism of the senses, are included in the core of the lexical system ("internal lexicon/vocabulary", "archetype", "primary symbol", "prototype", "praphenomenon" [11; 12] as the central structure of consciousness, reflected in the language.

The FD symbolic meanings are genuinely represented by a set of specific nominative acts as immanent units of different linguistic levels determined by features of both referents and language signs for their designation. FD as an information system is characterized by integrity of the sign structure, in which the act of constructing reality is performed through language designation, and the sign system itself – the language – is one of the major classifiers of the world. Key discourse-forming elements by means of cooperation of certain semiotic systems become the foundation of conceptual constructions.

The aim of the research is to reveal the linguistic essence of "family" symbols by analyzing the semiotics of the family language as a verbalized area of family discourse.

2. Methods

The scripts of modern German films, works of art of the last decade and the results of respondents surveying are used as research materials.

The ability of language units to denote fragments of reality is topical for cognitive and discursive paradigm in the perspective of signification. Based on Charles Peirce's theory of sign (classifying into three main trychotomies [13] – the sign as such, the meaning of the sign and its syntagmatic functioning in interaction with others), we observe the whole complex of characteristics of semiotic entities in intra-familial nominations.

3. Results

Within the first group we consider the quality realized in the process of identification of a sign and denotatum as qualisign. The sinsign represents a situational event of the nomination use; the legisign fixes a prototype situation of a certain nomination functioning in a particular ethnocultural familial scenario (cf. [14]. For example, a family nickname formed by the nomination *Apfelsina* as a qualisign implies the properties "rote Haare" and the metric name *Sina*; as a sinsign it indicates a specific speaker – the daughter named *Sina* (possessing properties indicated by a qualisign) in the situations of family communication; as a lehisign it directs to stereotypical scenarios of cooperative or coordinating family interaction.

The basic sense of FD "signification" is observed within the second group. Based on the division of signs into the icons (the similarity of thing), indices (modified similarity of thing) and symbols (dissimilarity of the thing, however being its precedent-determined interpretation) [15], in the FD context we notice the iconicity of familial nominations, in the internal form of which the denotatum characteristics is fixed (e. g., height or age – *der kleine Paulchen*), the hypothetical future (career of a model – *unsere Star-Modell* or musician – *Mozart aus Usedom*), the fact from the past (such as profession – *Gas-Erich*), an element of the scenario is nominated (often raises voice – *die Schrei-Gabi*), etc.

A symbol is a sign that has properties not determined by denotatum parameters properties, and due to combination of ideas is interpreted basing on the precedent – the existence of specific cases or regular sequences of events. Most of the signs in FD are symbols, as they make associative (including index) reference to familial medium or in any other indirect way, for example, through love poems, where elements of a complex sign show the iconicity features (private nominations actualizing certain properties of denotatum). The combination of elements of the sign enables to compare the denotatum with the information structure considering the index. In the particular situational familial context it serves as a symbol – a "switch" proving the "adequacy" of information and permission to deploy one of the scenarios of family communication.

The last – syntagmatic – group of signs is realized on the background of FD as a text (dicisign), which is activated in FD content by fragments directing deployment of a specific scenario of family interaction and relevant communicative situation (argument), and represents the peculiarities of the existing fragment of the world (sinsign). In its realization within the linear deployment of the specific type of scenario it can combine different discursive acts (embodied in turn by the signs of lower levels) in its structure.

Thus, the presence of powerful evaluative and value components in the FD structure and contents of discourse-forming elements gives a reason to assert the global symbolism of nominative units designating them in the language of German family.

4. Discussion

The symbolism of the "family" sign is determined by precedent-substantiated interpretation. The phenomenon of precedent causes understanding of FD as a typed one that presupposes the existence of a certain program of action in a particular situation in different families. Accordingly, the family precedent can be regarded as a family (verbalized or nonverbal) stereotype, unknown or little-known abroad. We consider the verbalized aspect of family precedents (despite awareness of its terminological imperfection, however realizing its adequacy for describing the peculiarities of the research subject) "family language".

The "family" precedent is based on the experience within a collective cognitive space – common (recognizable, used and cited by other members of the group – family) memories that determine the identity of a man as a representative of the family recognizing its values, norms, ideas, priorities, tastes and traditions. This in turn enables his orientation in a given socio-cultural environment, regulates vital functions, foresees their consequences, allowing a certain type, manner and form of communication. Complex signs, classified by genre as jokes, situations, stories that occurred during some important family events – weddings, christening-parties, joint vacations, celebrations of birthdays and religious holidays, as well as such family important events as repairs, move, etc. are symbolic family precedent units.

Iconicism is fixed at the phonetic level of precedent nominations (such as suffix element of male, female and neuter gender in implicit nominations of the family member responsible for the messy apartment, unwashed dishes – *Faul, Fauline, Faulinchen*). Phonetic means are widely used for marking emotional evaluative tints, indexing the symbolism of nominations and in such a way serving as a guide for the speaker as to the variety of FD (cooperative or confrontation).

The lexical level of the family language is broader represented by forms of address and nicknames. A form of address that some scientists consider a vocative pragmatic marker of discourse [16] or even distinguish as a vocative – a separate type of speech act [17], on the socio-psychological background of the group not only constructs the relationship between the speaker, recipient and others, but also acts as the most significant symbol of human communication, a universal key of contextualization that concentrates all the social world and is a guide to symbolic convergence – intersubjective phenomenological group space. As a central element of social deixis a form of address deploys a set of associations, inferences, expectations and anticipations.

Through addressing the speaker fits into a certain subjective position within the discursive structure, since discourses assign speakers the positions that they should occupy as subjects – not independent, but determined by the discourses ([18]). Addressing (by name, family and social roles, playfully official), getting a status of a "family" sign-symbol in the FD, catalyze its type on the side of the speaker-initiator and turn into a kind of "navigator" for the speaker-recipient.

Proper names as symbols and carriers of a certain concept as to objects (denotata) demonstrate the main discursive symbolism of a sign [19]. Indexing through modification mechanisms, the basic appeal function situationally gains either positive or negative connotative shades thus indicating the FD type – a cooperative one (where positive assessment is marked, for example, phonetically (*Gabi, Lisi, Hanse, Gerdchen, Jenser, Ronaldo, Hubertus, Mariele, Peterli, Roserl, Lising, Antje, Klausilein, Klarichen, Arrow, Friddo, Klär, Kät, Hens, Kers, Roni*) or by expansion of a metric name (*Sandmännchen (Sandmann), Meierlein (Meier)*), or a confrontation one (activated, for example, by certain substitution mechanisms (*Radeklepner (Rademacher), Scheißhenne (Mayer-Henne), Herr Vollidiot (Herr Kluge)*. In the family language, as a rule, dual variable strategically appropriate nominations of the same person are available, which are formed by various phonetic and lexical means (*Hoa, Colli/Fanta, Dala* in the cooperative, *Horst, Nicole, Daniella* – in confrontation communication).

Intrafamilial nicknames as special anthroponymic means of emotional evaluative nomination represent a significant layer of family language. Being located on the periphery of anthroponymic system through the combination of features of an appellative (characterizing function) and anthroponym (comparison with a particular individual) [20], they obtain the status of individually characterizing signs determined by multifunctionality, which is represented by onomastic and pragmatic functions.

The most productive way of family nicknames formation is using other names, names of objects, images based on associative conditioning. In the semasiological perspective we regard it as a process of discursive-specific symbolization of a sign, when the weakening of referent comparison in the inner form is compensated by strengthening of characterizing semes.

Specificity of FD creates particular opportunities for the nominative process, at which its mechanism is globally modified, becoming sometimes so deeply semantically implied that it enables to assume the special productivity of occasional word-building for FD. Occasionalism is observed both within specific ways of filling standard models (*das Elter (die Eltern), Bete (Beate)*, and in the use of non-standard, atypical formants (*die Daniella (Daniel), die Müllersche (Müller), Herzmatikus (Rheumatikus)*. Derivationally and syntactically formed nicknames as complex signs are simultaneously deictic markers, which implicitly refer to the information structures "behind the scenes" of a lexeme. Here, for example, the nomination *Tom und Jerry* as a syntactically-complicated sign verbalizes and realizes a discourse-forming concept *Kinder*, simultaneously referring to the scenario of "confrontative interaction", in which the concept *Kinder* implies the features *klein* and *feindlich*. The nomination *Die Schöne und der Biest* as a complex characterizing sign shows the opposition of categories, relatedness to the scenario of confrontation, which demonstrates the struggle of opposites that seek to construct the world in their own vision. We consider the construction *Der kleine Bismark aus Müllenshause* an indexed characterizing sign that points to a specific FD participant, containing determinants *(klein, aus Müllenshause)* giving the nickname age and locative distinguishing features; contains a comparison of the speaker with the historical figure based on specific organizational skills and volitional qualities, defining in this way the perspective of actions and deeds of a person as a certain scenario composition.

Hence, the intrafamilial nicknames appear to be the name-signs, in the inner form implying a certain content that correlates nomination by the index to the field of origin: appearance, traits, habits. In the communicative and pragmatic viewpoint the absence of nicknames may indicate deterioration of relations, general conflict atmosphere of a certain FD fragment or certain difficulties caused by permanent or occasional conflict situations.

The family language includes new intrafamilial formations that arise from innovations in speech often of an individual character preserving the semantic structure of the word (eg. *Doofino* to denote a foolish, senseless act; *öffig* – a usual within a family nomination of people behaving uncontrollably, which is etymologically formed by combining the lexemes *öffentlich* and *äffig*); formation of a new meaning (as part of the semantic structure of the word) as a result of regular usage (the phenomenon of personalization of certain items (e.g., cars *Blech, Elefant, Pfuff*; *die Macht* – TV remote, *guter/schlechter Freund* – boyfriends of the daughter remaining in this status for a long/ short time.

Referring in this context to the notion of implicature that is relevant for our research not only in terms of determining the expression meaning by formal features, but because of the implication mechanism, typical for most of precedent family phenomena, we consider most of these phenomena implicatures unconventional (communicative [21]/discursive [22]/ conversational [23]. Considering the complex, integrated nature of implicitness as a category, we observe all the levels of its manifestation in FD, the implicationale – on the level of intrafamilial nominations; implication – within precedent clichéd statements of family language; implicature – in the process of their situational use. We can assume that their purpose usually consists in not "unloading" the semantics of the sentence and the text by removing components of general communicative origin, but in symbolizing intrafamilial precedence, empha-

sizing group identity [24], indexing joint collective cognitive space [25]. The precedent nature of these language units as a rule provides their status as "access codes" to conceptual and discursive "familial" system as an information domain. The speaker choosing an adequate language unit subconsciously and associatively compares it both with the arsenal of verbalizers of discourse-forming elements, and with the main scenarios of family communication.

Not only the names of people, nominations of objects, but also the situations, texts or expressions demonstrate the family usage as the basis of secondary nomination. The examples of German familial verbal and non-verbal symbols reported by informants include an obligatory kiss at the meeting, raising hands in the crowd to find the familiar persons or to mark a wish to speak, a whistle to notify that the table is laid (totally unacceptable for Ukrainian families, where such action is prohibited from superstitious reasons), the so-called "Ort-Chiffre" (naming the figures on an imaginary clock face to indicate the person or thing if it is impossible to make it explicitly (eg. *guckmalneun* means '*look to the left*'), the use of precedent statements of literary origin (*Alle spielen hier Theater; Ich weiß nicht, was soll es bedeuten ...; Sprache ist die Quelle der Misverständnisse*). Family phatics is formed by: stories often repeated by parents, texts literally reflecting memories from childhood, texts of favorite poems, fairy-tales, puzzles transmitted in a slightly altered form, letters and postcards written by family members to each other, Santa Claus (or identical expression in the precedent text); peculiar system of nominations, like a language game, the basic techniques of which the parents' speech are often copied by children, who form new words by already known models.

Some precedent phrases, introduced by clichéd expressions (*So hat immer Oma gesagt; Das sind Mama's Worte; Ich kenne nicht den Grund, aber sie hat immer das wiederholt*) are included to the category of personal meanings as emotionally marked products of perceptual-cognitive information, and, respectively, directly accessible to understanding by other family members without getting any code to decrypt them.

In FD the hints of precedent situation are observed, which due to the iconic element become symbolic in FD: *Aber bitte nich wie gesternt, gegangen und alles vergessen* (to wife forgetting to throw away garbage); *Haben wir schon mal was verloren* (story of the bag left in the store, known by all members of the family); *Jemand war schon mal am Meer ...* (a reminder of the situation when the father almost drowned in the sea).

The semantics of the family language shows that its units are signs of special nature both by their word-formation and semantic unconventionality, motivation and meaning unpredictability, and by expressiveness and extralinguistic determinism. They are both primary, instinctively conditioned (main nominations of family members), and secondary, socially modified (diminutives, author's nominations, precedent family expressions and situations) symbols, supporting elements, that invariant "core", which unites the world picture of family members. The family language is a set of secondary symbols created by the family and related to emotional rituals. Integrating the family language signs in the scope of their functioning – FD – occurs on the base of mutual determinism, the speaker through the nomination as a sign affects the strategic perspective of the FD linear expansion, while the FD activates a certain segment of potential nomination as a sign. We consider the analysis of the FD concept system as a sphere of family nominations functioning perspective in the presented direction of research.

References

1. Jackendorff, R. (1995). Languages of the Mind. Essays on Mental Representation. Cambridge, 216.
2. Leibnyts, H. V. (1983). Sochynenyia. Vol. 2. Moscow, 686.
3. Kant, I. (2006). Kritika sposobnosti suzhdenyia. Saint Petersburg, 512.
4. Karmadonov, O. A. (2017). Mir, napolnennyy smyslom: simvolicheskoe modelirovanie real'nosti. Simvol v psikhologii i psikhoterapii. Moscow, 88.
5. Uaitkhed, A. N. (1999). Simvolizm, ego smysl i vozdeystvie. Tomsk, 64.
6. Ulybyna, E. V. (2002). Soznanie i bessoznatel'noe. Problemy znakovogo oposredovaniya. Stavropol, 228.
7. Vyhotskyi, L. S. (2007). Myshlenie i rech. Moscow, 504.
8. Yunh, K. (1991). Arkhetip i simvol. Moscow, 300.
9. Assadzhioli, R. (1994). Psikhosintez. Izlozhenie printsipov i rukovodstvo po tekhnike. Moscow, 286.
10. Lotman, Yu. M. (2004). Semiosfera. Saint Petersburg, 704.
11. Vezhbytskaia, A. (1983). Iz knihi «Semanticheskie primitivy». Moscow.
12. Halutskykh, Y. A. (2008). Yadro leksicheskoy sistemy angliyskogo yazyka: zavisimost' intensivnosti uchastiya v evolyutsionnykh protsessakh ot etimologicheskikh pokazateley. Moscow.
13. Pirs, Ch. S. (2000). Izbrannye filosofskie proizvedeniya. Moscow, 448.
14. Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. Pragmatics, 6 (2), 167–190. doi: 10.1075/prag.6.2.03fra
15. Bogdanov, V. V. (1989). Klassifikatsiya rechevykh aktov. Lichnostnye aspekty yazykovogo obshheniya, 25–37.
16. Laclau, E. (1993). Discourse. A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy. Oxford: Blackwell, 431–437.
17. Lanher, S. (2000). Filosofiya v novom klyuche: Issledovanie simvoliki razuma, rituala i iskusstva. Moscow, 287.
18. Zanadvorova, A. V. (2001). Prozvishhe i obrashhenie v semeynom rechevom obshhenii. Russkiy yazyk segodnya. Moscow: Azbukovnik, 260–267.
19. Makarov, M. L. (2003). Osnovy teorii diskursa. Moscow, 280.
20. Batsevych, F. S. (2004). Osnovy komunikatyvnoi linhvistyky. Kyiv, 344.
21. Dementev, V. V. (2001). Osnovy teoryi nepriamoi kommunikatsii. Saratov, 440.
22. Hurevych, L. S. (2011). Kognitivnoe prostranstvo metakommunikatsii: osnovy pragmasemanticheskogo izucheniya. Moscow, 400.
23. Afanasieva, O. M. (2018). Ontohnoseolohiia rytualu v linhvosemiotychnomu i komunikatyvnomu aspektakh (na materiali anhlomovnoi linhvokultury). Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology, VI (44 (151)), 8.