

3. Романські, германські та інші мови

IGREME AS A COMMUNICATIVE PHENOMENON

I.O. Biletska

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences,

Full Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Foreign Languages

Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University

Uman, Cherkasy Region, Ukraine

Any human activity, including language, always aims to achieve a pragmatic effect. A. Morohovskyi distinguishes means (tools) and methods (ways) in human activities. A goal-oriented character of a language activity leads to the fact that both its means and methods have a functional purpose.

Communication is understood as a social impact on the interlocutor in the process of interaction, meaning the delivery of information or metacommunication.

Linguistic studies suggest the analysis of a communicative act, taking into account the whole complex of its components. V. Chervonykh pays special attention to the totality of factors that ensure the flow of communication, considering their trinity, i.e. “author – text – recipient”. This model reflects the main stages of text generation and perception. To clarify the structure of a communicative act, we agree with I. Torsuieva that the context is cognitive rather than purely semantic, namely, meta-, macro- and micro-context. Summarizing the data, we can single out the following components of a communicative act, implemented in language games:

The extralingual aspect is represented by a consituation – an objectively existing situation of communication and conditions of its flow together with the participants.

1. The semantic aspect includes the context – implicitly or explicitly expressed meanings that are parts of the situation, reflected in the discourse and relevant for a certain communicative act.

2. The micro-presupposition (communicants' general knowledge about the situation based on a comic effect and understanding of all those meanings relevant to a certain communicative act).

3. The language realization that contributes to *igreme* actualization as a communicative unit.

S. Attard points out that "there is no humor in oneself and for oneself: humor always ... in the communicant's intentions ... the text is funny only when the interpreter has a certain perlocutive purpose" [1, p. 13].

To comprehend the *igreme*'s role in an utterance, one should understand not only the usual meaning of a linguistic unit, but also peculiarities of the situation of the utterance as pragmatically relevant is the very fact of a language game and not its origin or the process of creating. Rather controversial is the statement that "any native speaker can easily deduce the meaning of an unknown word without realizing its atypical function in an utterance ..." [2, p. 101] since, in our view, a language game is designed for a trained recipient, otherwise there is no point in using it.

Outside the context, most utterances are potentially ambiguous and, therefore, cannot be properly interpreted. According to S. Attard, *igreme* depends on the context and the recipient's attitude – on its comic potential, it can only exist in the context, which is why not all ambiguous utterances are puns "as there are no clues to them that would reveal their ambiguity – these keys allow us to identify two meanings that are hidden in the pun in several interpretations [1, p. 6-7]. So, the recipient, ready to search for hidden meanings, is one of the prerequisites for the pun's success, ambiguity produces the pun depending on the recipient's readiness for a communicative situation.

Pragmatic norms for a unit with atypical parameters result from the abuse of language conventions. In the pragmatics of this unit is coded the speaker's psychological installation on originality, effectiveness and novelty of perception.

In linguistic interaction with elements of a language game interlocutors are guided not so much by the intention to transfer information, when they are more concerned about organization and regulation of verbal interaction. To this end

communicants switch from the “bona fide communication” register to the “non-bona-fide communication” one. Within a language game as a type of activity appears the recipient’s need for social contacts, involvement in joint activities. In some cases, a language game can be self-sufficient when it is the sole purpose of communication that often occurs in metacommunication, for example, “How’s the weather up there?” (for tall people); “Killing a snake?” (when playing golf); “Do not work too hard!” (those who are going on vacation may say that to those who are working); “Yes, teacher”, “Yes, doctor” (for someone who gives instructions and teaches the interlocutor) [4].

In our view, the communicative and functional approach to the phenomenon of a language game reveals its interconnection and interdependence in linguistic interaction on the situation of discourse and purposes of communication. The features of a language game consist in its game-based essence, satisfying the need for communication, striving to entertain the communicants and realize the aesthetic function of language, friendly atmosphere, non-conflictiness.

As we can see, a language game is communicative and pragmatic and can serve as an effective means of verbal influence. To launch a comic mechanism it is required to successfully combine those factors that affect the efficiency of pragmatic influence (a communicative situation, the sender’s factor, the recipient’s factor, their intellect, emotions, etc.).

S. Attard points to importance of the interpretation of the comic, including humor as “a deliberate distortion of a normal, serious dialogue” [1]. G. Sherzer believes that the prototype case of using the comic, puns in particular, in the English culture is their conscious announcement and perception by the listeners as ambiguous [3].

As for a language game the sender aims at an emotionally rich communication. Equally significant is the fact that it requires the speaker’s conscious verbal efforts, suggesting solutions to intellectual tasks, creativity in communication. Indeed, different linguistic identities stick to different linguistic strategies when building utterances and the selection of these strategies defines the speaker’s style.

The igreme's sender manifests oneself as a creative linguistic identity that has a sufficient level of linguistic, communicative and encyclopedic competences. The sender's aspect in the study of language games is rather important to us due to the fact that it reflects the speaker's communicative installation. Using igremes in the situations of a language game suggests that it reflects the speaker's striving for an optimal organization of interaction, influence on the recipient's emotional sphere with their ratio, and through them – on their intellectual sphere. The sender's extralingual goals after switching to the game-based register of communication (unconventional use of characters, paradoxical interpretation of a new meaning of a linguistic unit) encompass attracting the interlocutor's attention, striving to entertain, defuse the situation, installing, maintaining and opening a verbal contact.

Thus, the recipient's intension that includes a language game into their speech, involves not so much transfer of cognitive information as influence on the recipient. In this regard, there is every reason to believe that the sender's aspect of a language game is linguistic influence. On the other hand, one should not exclude the recipient's intentionality: whether they choose a humorous interpretation of the text, and if so, what they think about the speaker's intention [1, c. 12]. We believe that studying a language game as a form of linguocreative thinking is of great importance in terms of studying its mechanisms that allow to predict linguistic influence taking into account the recipient's factor.

Communicative interaction in which there is a language game covers forms of linguistic behaviour, where the impact on intellectual and emotional spheres plays an important role.

Modern linguistics emphasizes the fact that within communicative activities speakers often use the mechanism of functional reorientation of linguistic units [3, c. 90], the use of which is included in the sender's intension and is focused on a certain level of the recipient's competence that perceives transformation and reconsideration of an utterance and the content of a linguistic unit.

In modern linguistic studies special attention is drawn to the view that the inclusion of language games in language may have an important sociolinguistic feature – phatic communication of linguistic identities belonging to educated social classes and the use of language games in communication suggests the installation on creativity and defines it as “the phenomenon of verbal communication, the content of which is the installation on the form of language, striving for achieving those effects similar to the effects of artistic literature” [2, c. 180]. A language game starts only after mastering the normative ways of verbal communication.

References:

1. Cook G. Language Play in Advertisements : some implications for applied linguistics / G. Cook // Evaluating Language. – Clevedon : BAAL, 2005. – P. 102–116.
2. Crystal D. Language Play / D. Crysta. – L. : Penguin, 2008. – 249 p.
3. Davies Ch. Jokes and Their Relation to Society / Ch. Davies. – Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. – 234 p.
4. Swan M. Practical English Usage / M. Swan. – Oxford University Press, 1995. – 658 p.