

UDC 811.161.2'01''16''

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/2520-6397.2023.2.07>

Yulia OLESHKO, PhD in Philology, Junior Researcher,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4154-101X

COMMUNICATIVE EMPATHY IN THE SERMONS OF ANTONII RADYVYLOVSKYI

The paper deals with empathy as a category of communicative linguistics. Generally speaking, empathy is an interpersonal phenomenon that determines the ability to project one's personality onto the object of contemplation and thus fully understand it. Verbal empathy is defined as the speaker's identification, which may vary in degree, with a person/thing that participates in the event. Linguistic empathy is a phenomenon that goes beyond grammar. The speaker's identification with a certain position is represented in the utterance through the unconscious/automatic choice of one of the normatively correct options, which convey a pragmatically different attitude. Such related to empathy concepts as point of view/viewpoint/perspective and deictic center are briefly discussed in the paper. They all are similar with what S. Kuno names "camera angle"; their meanings are overlapping, but not identical. The relationship between psychological empathy and linguistic/communicative empathy is defined in different ways: linguistic empathy is designed only to formally identify the speaker with a participant in the event referred to in the utterance, or linguistic empathy inevitably verbalizes the empathy and sympathy of another. When preaching, the priest must understand what his congregation feels (cognitive empathy) and convey these experiences accordingly (communicative empathy), and while conveying, mentally relate to the parishioners (affective empathy). In the sermons of the Baroque homilet of the 17th century Antonii Radyvylovskiy, perhaps the most important expression of the speaker's empathy towards his interlocutor-listener is the Old Ukrainian language. Other markers of communicative empathy, such as translation, interpretation, localization, folklore element use, have been identified in the sermons of Antonii Radyvylovskiy. Undoubtedly, among his listeners there were people of various backgrounds, educations and types of activity, since not only the brothers of the monastery were present during the service, but also "ordinary people" who came to pray to the Pechersk

miracle workers. Therefore, the author strives to compose sermons that would appreciate the first and understand the second. These sermons were to be accessible and popular.

Keywords: *communicative empathy, point of view, preaching discourse, Antonii Radyvylovskiy, Old Ukrainian literary language of the 17th century.*

A phenomenon of language empathy belongs to the sphere of interests of many modern scholars. Among them are such Ukrainian linguists as F. Batsevych [1], T. Kovalevska [4], L. Koziarevych [5], Y. Nevska [9], O. Nefedchenko [10], N. Tatsenko [14] and foreign researchers, namely O. Yokoyama [16], T. Kann [3], S. Kuno [7], D. Oshima [13] et al. In all these works, the phenomenon of empathy is studied on the basis of modern languages. Analysis of communicative empathy based on the material of historical monuments, determination of its markers in the Old Ukrainian preaching discourse of the 17th century determines the **novelty** of this scientific exploration. Its correspondence to modern linguistics, which is based on the principle of anthropocentrism, the study of human interaction in the act of communication, the reinterpretation of the preaching discourse of the 17th century confirm the **relevance** of this paper.

The phenomenon of language/speech empathy is considered within the framework of psycholinguistics, pragmalinguistics, discourse analysis and conceptual semantics; however, to a greater or lesser extent, researchers refer to works on psychology and philosophy. T. Kann defines that psychological empathy is "a social psychological notion that allows a person to understand and experience the emotional reality of others" [3, p. II]. Psychological empathy allows a person to navigate productively in the social and emotional landscape in which the interaction between the speaker and others takes place. M. Davis, followed by other psychologists, believes that empathy is a construct that combines the following components: affective empathy and cognitive empathy. Cognitive empathy refers to one's own understanding of another person's condition. Affective empathy is the next step; emotional reactions of affective empathy are usually classified as parallel (i.e. experiencing the same emotion) or reactive (i.e. sympathy, pity or empathy) [2, p. 7]. Thus, empathy should be considered as an interpersonal phenomenon,

which determines the ability to project one's personality onto the object of contemplation and thereby fully understand it.

The connection between psychological empathy and linguistic/communicative empathy is defined in different ways: linguistic empathy is designed only to formally identify the speaker with a participant in the event referred to in the utterance, or linguistic empathy inevitably verbalizes the empathy and sympathy of the other.

The concept of empathy was first introduced into linguistic circulation by S. Kuno in the late 1970s. His definition is as follows: "empathy is the speaker's identification, which may vary in degree, with a person/thing that participates in the event or state that he describes in the sentence" [7, p. 206]. S. Kuno develops the theory of empathy in syntax based on the following observation: the speaker takes the position of something and presents information from this point of view. A linguist explains the concept of point of view by comparing it to what is called a "camera angle" in photography.

In this sense, S. Kuno mainly uses the concept of empathy to explain sentence structures. For example, in Japanese, there are two verbs for the action of "giving": *kureru* and *yaru*. Their use depends on the syntactic role of the noun or pronoun, which designates the speaker or corresponds to the perspective from which he looks at the event. If it is the subject (nominative case), then the verb *yaru* will be used; if it is an indirect object (dative), then the verb *kureru* will be used.

However, language empathy is a phenomenon that goes beyond grammar. The speaker's identification with a certain position is represented in the utterance through the unconscious/automatic choice of one of the normatively correct options, which convey a pragmatically different attitude.

D. Oshima determines how a point of view is expressed in language through the alternation of active/passive constructions, anaphora, deixis, semantic-pragmatic combination, narrative styles, and discourse. The researcher distinguishes between the deictic center and the locus of empathy, although other researchers consider them equivalent. Deictic center refers to a reference point that is "the object relative to which the meaning (content) of a deictic expression is determined" [13, p. 23], while the locus of empathy refers to the physical or conceptual center from which the perspective in the utterance emanates.

In addition to the deictic center, the concept of point of view (viewpoint) is close to empathy. This interdisciplinary term can refer to a visual point of view, a dogmatic position, a cognitive point of view, or a verbalization of that view, as in linguistics.

From a literary point of view, B. Uspensky outlines four categories that can be used to define a point of view: psychological characteristics (thoughts, feelings, human experience), verbal characteristics (dialect, referential expressions that reflect beliefs or views), spatial and temporal characteristics (similar to what S. Kuno calls the "camera angle"; the use of the present tense, as a rule, corresponds to the internal point of view, and the past to the external point of view), ideological assessment (beliefs and positions reflected in the discourse) [15, p. 8].

F. Batsevych considers point of view and empathy as pragmatic categories of communication. The linguist considers empathy to be dominant in cooperative communication and defines its structure as follows: focus and background. "The focus of empathy is a participant in the event depicted in the sentence (expression), who is in the center of attention, interests (i.e., empathy) of the author (addressee, speaker)" [1, p. 119]. The background of empathy is made up of other participants in the event, who "shade" the focus.

F. Batsevych distinguishes between semantic and pragmatic empathy. Semantic empathy is "a component of the informational arrangement of the "packaging" of the content of messages (sentences, expressions) from certain worldview positions of the addressee (his point of view). Pragmatic empathy is a component of the pragmatics of an utterance (text), which reflects the emotional, expressive, aesthetic attitude of the addressee to the message, which can be neutral, positive or negative" [1, p. 121].

According to F. Batsevych, certain discourses and speech genres naturally presuppose the addressee's empathy towards one of the participants in the communicative process. In our opinion, preaching in the strict sense cannot be counted among them, since it is characterized by a certain set of communicators (God – the preacher – the flock), and its purpose is to convey to the audience the basics of the faith for the purpose of clarification, instructions, recommendations of proper behavior in accordance with the value

base of Orthodoxy. The communicative interaction between the agent and the super-agent in the preaching discourse is explained by N. Odarchuk and S. Nedilko as follows: "Although the preacher is to some extent a speaker, however, unlike the latter, he conveys the word of God, and therefore, his thoughts and words do not belong only to him – they are subordinated to the Christian faith, therefore the presbyter does not impose his opinion with the sermon, but tries to bring the recipient closer to God." [12, p. 156]. That is why it is characteristic of the preacher to empathize with the referent of the subject of speech, God or himself, as a mediator between Him and His flock. However, the success of any communication – and the sermon will not be an exception here – directly depends on the speaker's understanding of his interlocutor, his knowledge, experience, views, aspirations, desires, which will contribute to the perlocutionary effect. When preaching, the priest must understand what his congregation feels (cognitive empathy) and convey these experiences accordingly (communicative empathy), and while conveying, mentally relate to the parishioners (affective empathy).

In the sermons of the baroque homilet of the 17th century, according to A. Radyvylovskiy, perhaps the most important expression of the speaker's empathy towards his interlocutor-listener is the Old Ukrainian language. As O. Nika notes, "guidelines for interactivity, dialogicity, accessibility and recognizability of the Old Ukrainian sermon of the 17th century testified to the rapprochement of the written language with the spoken, folk language, and orientation towards the scribes of that time, and more broadly, towards the «common people»" [11, p. 169]. The conscious choice of the Old Ukrainian language as opposed to Church Slavonic proves the speaker's desire to be modern and to be heard so as to get closer to his recipient. The language of A. Radyvylovskiy's sermons is discussed in detail in the sixth chapter of M. Markovskiy's work [8].

M. Markovskiy emphasizes that the preacher always addresses the "Orthodox listener". From this, he concludes that Radyvylovskiy's speech was undoubtedly directed "to the people", the motley audience that gathered at the church service. Undoubtedly, among these listeners there were people of various backgrounds, educations and types of activity, since not only the brothers of the monastery

were present during the service, but also the "ordinary people" who came to pray to the Pechersk miracle workers. Therefore, the author strives to compose sermons that would appreciate the first and understand the second. These sermons were supposed to be accessible and popular [8, p. 16].

In the manuscript volumes of the sermons, there are many marginal glosses that explain/translate obscure words. In the printed collections of A. Radyvylovskiy, these glosses are moved into the structure of the text, thus turning into intratextual glosses or completely replacing the glossed word in the manuscript. The speaker conveys the equivalence of voiced words using markers *то есть*, *албо* (*that is, id est*), e. g.: *оутрапїена, албо скорби* (O., p. 61), *скуделнича, то есть гончарского* (O., p. 61).

In the preaching discourse, a prominent place is given to the biblical quote. A baroque sermon, following the theoretical instructions of I. Haliatovskiy, begins with a quotation from the Holy Scriptures, which the sermon develops and on which the discourse is built. The addressee carefully elaborates the rich quotability of the discourse from the point of view of receptivity and accessibility for the addressee, shortens lengthy quotations, translates complex/rarely used Church Slavonic words into them, explains metaphorical ones, for example: *...се той твораше дѣло на колесѣ. То есть, се Діоклитїанъ выдалъ декретъ, абы Георгїа стѣго мучено на колесѣ* (O., p. 62).

Marking certain information as new indicates the use of a "camera angle" by the recipient. Compare *в(ъ) Параквіей прови(н)ціи, захо(д)неи Индіи* (O., p. 347) and *приходитъ до Іерусалиму* (O., p. 342). The presupposition of the first statement is that the specified geographical location is not known to the listener, and therefore requires clarification. Instead, Jerusalem, regardless of whether the listener knows in which part of the world it is located, is a point in symbolic space known to every believer.

The way the preacher attributes the mentioned persons also attracts attention. Consider appositions in such cases as *нише(т) Аристотеле(с) филозофъ* (O., p. 330) and *Софоклесъ поета* (O., p. 231), which help to identify the persons mentioned, and therefore indicate that they are little known to the audience. On the other hand,

in the phrase *такъ мовить Августинь* (О., р. 157), one can understand that St. Augustine is a popular, recurring figure in church texts, and therefore is known and familiar to the faithful. Undoubtedly, the discourse of the sermon is not built from the point of view of an educated priest who quotes a wide range of theologians and scientists, contemporaries and predecessors, therefore, simply *Аристотелесь* and *Софоклесь* would be enough to understand who it is about.

It is worth noting that A. Radyvylovskiy had a noble origin and valued education; accordingly, his appeal to vernacular language and folklore elements is conscious. In addition to proverbs, legends, superstitions and other types of folk art, which were carefully analyzed and classified in the work of V. Krekoten [6], the sermon contains analogies that are understandable and close to the common man. To explain how trouble and misfortune "highlight" a person's moral traits, the speaker uses the following everyday example: *Суть нѣкоторїи древка згнїлыи и спрoхнѣлыи, суть барзo подлыи и малыи нѣкоторїи робачки, которїи в(ъ) днѣ жадногo не маю(т) позору, жаднои окрасы, и овшемъ шпетныи суть и чорныи. Прїйдетъ ноцъ, ажъ они ясность з(ъ) себе выдають на киталть оуглѣа горацагo* (О., р. 1088).

Localization of objects unknown to the local audience is a common technique among both Ukrainian and Polish preachers of the 17th century. In order to be heard, "Antonii Radyvylovskiy Ukrainianizes, dressing them in Ukrainian language clothing, using characteristic folk vocabulary and phraseology, introducing purely local concepts." [6, р. 203]. The speaker "relocates" biblical figures in the chronotope of the listener, for example: *которого кола е(ст) марша(л)ко(м) стѣий Іоа(н) Пр(д)теча* (О., р. 68), *коли волѣли быти в(ъ) нѣбѣ единою обители ω(т) Хѣ себи данои дѣдичами* (О., р. 276), *Петра избра Гѣ, абы былъ гетманомъ (оу)чниковъ* (О., р. 187).

The more in common between the speaker and the recipient, the easier and more natural it is to empathize with this recipient [13, р. 27]. Equality before God, unity and cooperation between communicants are expressed with the help of the personal pronoun *мы* (we). United by faith, the preacher and his audience appear as a collective of persons who happened to live at the same time and be

involved in the same events: *Слухачу православный, яко жъ **мы** **теперъ** ѿ Бѣу противко себе розумѣти маемъ? Коли **насъ** **прешлыхъ** лѣтъ каралъ гладомъ, повѣтрем(ъ)?* (О., p. 1077).

The speaker is physically in the same location as the listener. And cognitively, he is also in the same position as the listener. Therefore, empathy towards the recipient is based, among other things, on a common spatial characteristic and the values associated with it: *Аза(ж) ю(ж) не пройшо(л) значне меч(ъ) **земли нашей Россійской**?* (О., p. 1078). Pointing to a specific territory narrows the circle of potential communicants (the sermon loses its universality), re-emphasizes the unifying marker from a common faith to a common homeland. In addition, the assignment of the specified location to all those on whose behalf the addressee speaks symbolically unites him with the addressee, and therefore the experience of troubles, which are discussed in the discourse, is also shared among all communicators.

The empathy of the sermon directly depends on its ideological and thematic direction. Saying on the saint's day is based on hagiographic literature, and the starting point of view in this case cannot be the listener (except for individual statements). Empathy becomes more pronounced in sermons of a social and psychological orientation. Despite the fact that researchers claim that the Orthodox priests of the 17th century were deliberately aloof from political events, preaching discourse responds sensitively to the challenges of its time. "Слово о скорбехъ" ("Sermon on sorrow") and "Слово побоужающее до мѣтвы и постоу, часоу военнѡ небезпеченства" ("Sermon encouraging prayer and fasting in wartime danger") demonstrate a higher level of communicative empathy, in accordance with the level of psychological empathy. This is due to the fact that the treasurer experienced "военне небезпеченство" ("wartime danger") himself, and therefore the "point of view" of his audience was easily accessible to him. Communicative empathy testifies to the speaker's desire for interactivity and dialogue, and in the conditions of social and political dangers, the desire to support and reassure all those who need it, to "soothe" sorrow ("скорби"), troubles ("оутраченѧ") and oppressions ("оутиски"), achieve a therapeutic effect with a word.

REFERENCES

1. Batsevych, F. S. *Osnovy komunikatyvnoyi linhvistyky : pidruchnyk [druhe vydannia, dopovnene]*. K. : VTs Akademiya, 2009. 376 s. (Serii Alma-mater).
2. Davis, M. *Empathy: a social psychological approach*. Boulder : Westview Press, 1996. 44 p.
3. Kann, T. *Measuring Linguistic Empathy: An Experimental Approach to Connecting Linguistic and Social Psychological Notions of Empathy*. A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics. University of California. Los Angeles, 2017. 114 p.
4. Kovalevska, T. Y. *Modeliuvannia empatiyyi v suchasniy ukrayinskii movi : dys. ... doktora filol. nauk : 10.02.04 ; Odesk. nats. un-t im. I. I. Mechny-kova*. Odesa, 2002. 439 s.
5. Koziarevych, L.V. *Verbalni i neverbalni zasoby empatyzatsii dialo-hichnoho dyskursu (na materialy anhlomovnoyi prozy 20 stolittia) : dys. ... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.04*. Kyiv, 2006. 191 s.
6. Krekoten, V. I. *Opovidannia Antoniia Radyvylovskoho : z istoriyi ukr. novelistyky 17 st. : [monohrafiya]*. AN URSSR, In-t l-ry im. T. H. Shevchenka. K. : Naukova dumka, 1983. 407 s.
7. Kuno, S. *Functional syntax: Anaphora, discourse, and empathy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. 320 pp.
8. Markovskiy, M. M. *Antonii Radivilovskii, yuzhno-russkii propo-viednik 17 v. Universitetskiye izviestiya. K., 1894. № 1, 4, 7, 9*.
9. Nevska, Y. V. *Empatiya yak oznaka dilovoho lystuvannia M. Kulisha. Linhvistychni doslidzhennia : zb. naukovykh prats праць KhNPU im. H. S. Skovorody. 2012. Vyp. 34. S. 179–186*.
10. Nefedchenko, O. I. *Poniattia empatiyyi v linhvistytsi. Filolohichni traktaty. T.8, № 1. 2016. S. 46–53*.
11. Nika, O. I. *Barokova propovid 17 st. i rozvytok staroukrayinskoyi literaturnoyi movy. Studia Linguistica. №6. 2012. S. 165–170*.
12. Odarchuk, N., Nedilko, S. *Realizatsiya movlennievoho vplyvu v suchasnomu anhlomovnomu relihiinomu dyskursi. Aktualni pytannia inozemnoyi filolohiyi. Naukovyi zhurnal. № 9/2018. S. 154–161*.
13. Oshima, D. Y. *On empathic and logophoric binding. Research on Language and Computation, 5(1), 2007. Pp. 19–35*.
14. Tatsenko, N. *Empathy as a self-organized cognitive model: a linguistic synergetic perspective. Lege Artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. Vol. V. No 1, 2020. Pp. 390–423*.

15. Uspensky, B. A. Structural isomorphism of verbal and visual art. *Poetics*, 5(C), 1972. Pp. 5–39.

16. Yokoyama, O. T. The Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy and Russian possessives. In A. Kamio and K.-I. Takami, (eds.), *Function and structure*, 57-82. Amsterdam Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1999.

SOURCES

О. – Radyvylovskiy, A. *Ohorodok Mariyi Bohorodytsi*. K., 1676. Starodruk TsNBV, Sh. Kyр. 46. 1128 s.

Юлія ОЛЕШКО, канд. філол. наук, мол. наук. співроб.,
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка,
Київ, Україна

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4154-101X

КОМУНІКАТИВНА ЕМПАТІЯ В ПРОПОВІДЯХ АНТОНІЯ РАДИВИЛОВСЬКОГО

Розглянуто емпатію як категорію комунікативної лінгвістики. Продемонстровано зв'язок між такими явищами, як психологічна емпатія і комунікативна емпатія. Проаналізовано комунікативну емпатію з погляду спрямованості на діалогічність та інтерактивність староукраїнського проповідницького дискурсу XVII ст. Ідентифіковано маркери комунікативної емпатії в казаннях Антонія Радивиловського.

Ключові слова: комунікативна емпатія, точка зору, проповідницький дискурс, Антоній Радивиловський, староукраїнська літературна мова XVII ст.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Бацевич Ф. С. *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики* : підручник [2-ге вид., доп.]. К. : ВЦ Академія, 2009. 376 с. (Серія Альма-матер).

2. Davis M. *Empathy: a social psychological approach*. Boulder : Westview Press, 1996. 44 p.

3. Kann T. *Measuring Linguistic Empathy: An Experimental Approach to Connecting Linguistic and Social Psychological Notions of Empathy*. A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics. University of California. Los Angeles, 2017. 114 p.

4. Ковалевська Т. Ю. Моделювання емпатії в сучасній українській мові : дис. ... доктора філол. наук : 10.02.04 ; Одеськ. нац. ун-т. ім. І. І. Мечникова. Одеса, 2002. 439 с.
5. Козяревич Л. В. Вербальні й невербальні засоби емпатизації діалогічного дискурсу (на матеріалі англومовної прози ХХ століття) : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Київ, 2006. 191 с.
6. Крекотень В. І. Оповідання Антонія Радивиловського : з історії укр. новелістики ХVІІ ст.: [монографія]. АН УРСР, Ін-т л-ри ім. Т. Г. Шевченка. К. : Наукова думка, 1983. 407 с.
7. Kuno S. Functional syntax: Anaphora, discourse, and empathy. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. 320 pp.
8. Марковський М. М. Антоній Радивилівський, южно-руський проповідник ХVІІ в. Университетские известия. К., 1894. № 1, 4, 7, 9.
9. Невська Ю. В. Емпатія як ознака ділового листування М. Куліша. *Лінгвістичні дослідження* : зб. наукових праць ХНПУ ім. Г. С. Сковороди. 2012. Вип. 34. С. 179–186.
10. Нефедченко О. І. Поняття емпатії в лінгвістиці. Філологічні трактати. Т. 8, № 1. 2016. С. 46–53.
11. Ніка О. І. Барокова проповідь ХVІІ ст. і розвиток староукраїнської літературної мови. *Studia Linguistica*. Вип. 6. 2012. С. 165–170.
12. Одарчук Н., Неділько С. Реалізація мовленнєвого впливу в сучасному англومовному релігійному дискурсі. *Актуальні питання іноземної філології*. Науковий журнал. № 9/2018. С. 154–161.
13. Oshima D. Y. On empathic and logophoric binding. *Research on Language and Computation*, 5(1), 2007. Pp. 19–35.
14. Tatsenko N. Empathy as a self-organized cognitive model: a linguistic synergetic perspective. *Lege Artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. Vol. V. No 1, 2020. Pp. 390–423.
15. Uspensky B. A. Structural isomorphism of verbal and visual art. *Poetics*, 5(C), 1972. Pp. 5–39.
16. Yokoyama O. T. The Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy and Russian possessives. In A. Kamio and K.-I. Takami, (eds.), *Function and structure*, 57–82. Amsterdam Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1999.

УМОВНІ СКОРОЧЕННЯ НАЗВ ДЖЕРЕЛ

О. – Радивилівський А. Огородок Марії Богородици. К., 1676. Стародрук ЦНБВ, Ш. Кир. 46. 1128 с.

Дата надходження до редакційної колегії – 02.11.2022
 Дата затвердження редакційною колегією – 16.12.2022