



The pragmatic aspect in the interpretation of kinem

Kenjayeve Zemfira Alimjanovna

Senior teacher of UZSHWLU

ABSTRACT

Pragmatics is a section of semiotics. Studies the features of the use of signs in communication, the relationship of signs to the interpreter. Pragmatic factors include a wide variety of information. This information allows us to establish the meaning of language expressions and utterances in a given situational (pragmatic) context.

Keywords:

background knowledge, presuppositions, social norms, situational context, interpreter

Introduction

Pragmatics is a section of semiotics. Studies the features of the use of signs in communication, the relationship of signs to the interpreter. Pragmatic factors include a wide variety of information. This information allows us to establish the meaning of language expressions and utterances in a given situational (pragmatic) context.

N. V. Voloshinov gives such an example. Two people are sitting in a room. They are silent. One says: So! Taken in isolation, it has meaning, but it does not make sense, because it can relate to any situation and take any meaning in this situation. The meaning of the statement is clarified only if the communication situation in which this expression is pronounced is clarified. Let's say, N. V. Voloshinov continues, at the moment of the conversation, the interlocutors, looking out the window, see snow; moreover, they know that it's May and that it's time to be spring; the prolonged winter is tired, and they are upset by the late snowfall. As a meaningful whole, the utterance thus consists of two parts:

verbally implemented (actualized) and implied parts.

This kind of "knowledge in parentheses" is included in the interpretation as an implicit component of the statement. But it can hardly be justified semantically, since there are no semantic rules by which it could be associated with the explicit content of the utterance.

Let's take the statement Cold! Out of context, this linguistic expression can mean anything: in the address of a flirt to a boyfriend – "hug me", in the address of a wife to her husband – "it is necessary to seal the windows", in the address of a boss to a subordinate – "close the window", "bring hot tea", etc. As a variable, the meaning of the utterance depends, therefore, on the conditions of use, or rather: on the pragmatic context and the associated typical scenario that models the behavior of the persons involved – in our case, suitors, husbands and subordinates, in accordance with the distribution of roles that has developed in society.

As another example, we will give such a conversation in public transport:

– What time is it? (he)

– I'm happy (she)

A correct understanding of the words included in the utterance does not exclude incorrect interpretation. To understand why a random traveling companion responds to a request for information about the time of day with a confession in the best mood, it is possible only against the background of the well-known "winged" phrase Happy hours are not observed. In the absence of such a background, the statement I am happy is perceived as abnormal, as not meeting the requirements of "cooperative" communication, compliance with which is required, according to G. P. Grice, from communication participants.

■ Another example. The statement Will rain can be understood in different ways depending on what meaning the speaker puts into it: (i) is he looking forward to rain during a drought, (ii) is going to fly by plane, (iii) is considering whether to take an umbrella, (iv) has nothing to say or (v) is simply suffering out of boredom.

As an external variable, the pragmatic component thus refers not to a sentence, but to an utterance through which the speaker expresses his attitude to the fact of the utterance. Without this, the meaning of the phrase seems incomplete, and the questions where, when it will rain and what I care about it do not find an answer.

Any background knowledge functions as pragmatic factors of meaning in interpretation. Pragmatic factors include a wide variety of information, and this information is set depending on research priorities as encyclopedic knowledge, social norms, frames, propositional attitudes, intentions, opinions and beliefs. This information allows us to establish the meaning of the analyzed statements in a given situational context.

Social norms. Pragmatic factors include the so-called social (cultural) norms, various kinds of social institutions that somehow affect the nature of the meaning of the statement - "majority opinion" in Plato's definition, "what

seems right to everyone or most people" in Aristotle's definition, "prejudices" (préjugés) in the definition of H.-G. Gadamer, the "implied" of a family, clan, nation, class, social group in the definition of V. N. Voloshinov.

Indeed, along with the functional system of language, other "system instances" have to be taken into account in the interpretation of language works (F. Rastier). And not only because every communicative situation is modeled in accordance with some typical scenario, but also because the specific lexical and grammatical support that the language has for denoting relationships within a situation is brought into line with a generally valid convention on how to behave, how to understand and what to say in such a situation. For example, when an outraged buyer tells the seller: You have hung me!, it is assumed that sellers should not hang buyers. In this understanding, the implied part of the statement is consistent with the system of opinions and ideas that has developed in society. Social norms thus act as a function of pragmatic presupposition.

Social norms are additional coding systems.

Knowledge of the language system corresponds to semantic competence, knowledge of the social norms incorporated in the work corresponds to pragmatic competence.

Social norms "correct" the system meaning fixed in the language within a given subject (conceptual) area.

Normative judgments cannot be given a truth value, but can only be checked for compliance with some norm within the limits of "permissible" - "unacceptable", "appropriate" - "inappropriate", "possible" - "impossible".

Questions and tasks

- When you are offered coffee, and you say: I have to get up early tomorrow, what is the pragmatic presupposition?
- Give examples when pragmatic competence allows you to "correct" in the context of the

systemic meaning of the words and expressions included in the utterance.

- Give examples when, in the absence of a pragmatic context, the most banal phrase becomes ambiguous or ambiguous.

Conclusion

- Pragmatic factors include a wide variety of information.
- The interpretation of statements cannot be limited to the functional system of the language.
- Semantics is assigned conventional meanings established in the language system, pragmatics – their direct use in speech.
- Understanding is provided by knowledge of the meaning of words and sentences (semantic competence), interpretation is provided by knowledge of the mechanisms of language use (pragmatic competence). The object of understanding is a constant value; interpretation is aimed at the variable communicative meaning of the words in the utterance and the utterances themselves (N. D. Arutyunova).
- In a variable pragmatic situation, the meaning of all words and phrases included in the utterance can only be variable.
- Along with the linguistic context, a broad pragmatic context can also function as an interpreter.
- To understand the meaning of the analyzed language sequence, one language encoding / decoding is not enough.
- Pragmatic presuppositions function according to the type of an enthymeme, or an abbreviated syllogism, when it is possible to omit (not to speak) what is obviously known.

References

1. Arutyunova N. D. Pragmatics // Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1990. pp. 389-390.
2. Bochkarev A. E. Semantics. The basic vocabulary. Nizhny Novgorod: DECOM, 2014.
3. Van Dijk T. A. Questions of text pragmatics // New in foreign linguistics. Issue VIII. Linguistics of the text. M.: Progress, 1978. pp. 259-336.