

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

КУРСОВА РОБОТА

з лінгвістики

на тему: **Модифікація прагматичного значення
висловлення в сучасній англійській мові**

Студентки 4 курсу групи Мла 07-20
Факультету германської філології і перекладу
Напряму підготовки 035 “Філологія”
Спеціальності Германські мови та літератури
(переклад включно), перша – англійська
Письменної Марини Василівни
Керівник **Березенко В.М.**,
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів: _____ Оцінка: ЄКТС _____

Члени комісії

_____	_____
(підпис)	(прізвище та ініціали)
_____	_____
(підпис)	(прізвище та ініціали)
_____	_____
(підпис)	(прізвище та ініціали)

м. Київ – 2024 р.

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugric Philology

COURSE PAPER

**Modification of the pragmatic meaning of the utterance
in Modern English**

PYSMENNA MARYNA

Group MLa 07-20

Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **VICTORIYA BEREZENKO**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2024

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR STUDYING PRAGMATICS.....	7
1.1. Concept of pragmatics and its role in linguistics	7
1.2. Context and its role in understanding pragmatic meaning.....	10
1.3. Means of expressing pragmatic meaning in utterances	12
Conclusions to Chapter One	15
CHAPTER TWO. ANALYSIS OF THE PRAGMATIC MODIFICATION OF THE UTTERANCE IN THE MODERN ENGLISH LANGUAGE	16
2.1. The influence of linguistic context on pragmatic meaning	16
2.2. The relationship between sociocultural factors and the pragmatic meaning of the expression	21
2.3. Linguistic means of modifying pragmatic meaning	24
Conclusions to Chapter Two.....	26
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	27
RÉSUMÉ	28
LITERATURE CITED.....	29
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS	32

INTRODUCTION

In the study of language and communication, pragmatics plays a crucial role in understanding how meaning is conveyed beyond the literal interpretation of words. Pragmatic meaning encompasses the intentions of speakers, the context of communication, and the shared knowledge between interlocutors, all of which influence the interpretation of utterances. While the semantic meaning of a sentence remains constant, its pragmatic meaning can be modified through various linguistic and contextual factors.

The **topicality** of studying the modification of pragmatic meaning in Modern English lies in its significance for understanding the intricacies of communication in contemporary linguistic interactions. In today's globalized and rapidly evolving world, effective communication is paramount across various contexts, including personal, professional, academic, and digital spheres.

The object of research is pragmatic meaning of utterances.

The subject of research is the modification of pragmatic meaning in Modern English utterances.

The aim of research is to investigate and analyze the various linguistic mechanisms and contextual factors that contribute to the modification of pragmatic meaning in contemporary English discourse.

The aim mentioned above envisages the fulfillment of following **tasks** of the research:

- to conduct a literature review to define the concept of pragmatics and its significance in linguistics;
- to investigate the influence of context, including linguistic, situational, social, and cultural factors, on pragmatic meaning;
- to explore various linguistic means, used to convey pragmatic meaning;
- to analyze examples to illustrate how linguistic context shapes the modification of pragmatic meaning in Modern English;

- to analyze examples to demonstrate how sociocultural factors contribute to the variation in pragmatic meaning in Modern English;
- to analyze examples to illustrate how linguistic means are employed to convey nuanced pragmatic interpretations in Modern English.

To achieve the objectives outlined in the coursework, the following theoretical and practical **methods** of research were employed:

➤ **Literature Review.** Conducted an extensive review of relevant literature on pragmatics, linguistic context, and the modification of pragmatic meaning in Modern English. This involved analyzing scholarly articles, books, and research papers to establish a theoretical framework for the study.

➤ **Empirical Analysis.** Utilized empirical analysis to examine real-world examples of utterances in Modern English. This involved collecting linguistic data from various sources, including written texts, spoken discourse, and multimedia sources, to analyze how pragmatic meaning is modified in different communicative contexts.

➤ **Contextual Analysis.** Employed contextual analysis to investigate the influence of linguistic, situational, social, and cultural factors on pragmatic interpretation. This involved examining the context in which utterances occur to understand how these factors shape the pragmatic meaning of language use.

➤ **Comparative Analysis.** Conducted comparative analysis to compare and contrast different instances of pragmatic modification within utterances

➤ **Method of linguistic text analysis.** Developed a theoretical framework for analyzing the modification of pragmatic meaning in Modern English.

The novelty of this research lies in its comprehensive investigation into the modification of pragmatic meaning within utterances in Modern English. While previous studies have explored various aspects of pragmatics and linguistic context, this research specifically targets the pragmatic modification of utterances in Modern English, acknowledging the evolving nature of language use in contemporary contexts.

The theoretical value of this research lies in its contribution to advancing our understanding of pragmatics and linguistic context through an in-depth exploration of the modification of pragmatic meaning within utterances in Modern English.

The practical value. By offering practical insights and tools for navigating pragmatic meaning modification in real-world communication contexts, this research contributes to enhancing language teaching, communication practices, intercultural understanding, and language policy development, ultimately bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application in the field of pragmatics and linguistic context.

The coursework comprises two main chapters, each followed by conclusions, as well as general conclusions, a résumé, bibliography, and a list of illustrative material.

The **introduction** provides a concise overview of the theoretical assumptions, rationale for the topic selection, main objectives, and tasks of the research, as well as the theoretical and practical significance of the investigation.

Chapter One, titled “Methodology and Theoretical Framework for Studying Pragmatics”, explores the fundamental concepts of pragmatics and its significance in linguistics. It delves into the role of context in understanding pragmatic meaning and examines various linguistic means of expressing pragmatic meaning in utterances.

Chapter Two, titled “Analysis of the Pragmatic Modification of Utterances in Modern English Language”, investigates specific aspects related to pragmatic meaning modification. It analyzes the influence of linguistic context on pragmatic meaning, explores the relationship between sociocultural factors and pragmatic meaning, and examines linguistic means used to modify pragmatic meaning in utterances.

General conclusions serve to consolidate the overall achievements of the research, highlighting the most significant theoretical and practical outcomes.

The main points of this work were published in the corresponding abstracts and presented at the international scientific-practical conference "Ad orbem per linguas. To the world through languages" (May 16-17, 2024, KNLU).

CHAPTER ONE

METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR STUDYING PRAGMATICS

1.1. Concept of pragmatics and its role in linguistics

Understanding language goes beyond the mere analysis of words and their structures. Pragmatics, as a fundamental branch of linguistics, delves into the contextual and social aspects of language use.

In the late 20th and early 21st centuries Ch. Peirce, the progenitor of semiotics, introduced a model of semiosis that integrated a sign, an object, and an interpretant (in Atkin, 2013). Alongside Peirce, Ch. Morris, who coined the term “**pragmatics**” in its modern sense, emphasized the crucial role of the subject in communicative activity. He delineated the pragmatic dimension within a comprehensive five-component structure comprising a sign, an **interpretant**, an **interpreter**, a **significate**, and a **denotatum** (Morris, 1971).

These contributions represent pivotal moments in the evolution of linguistic thought, underscoring the human-centric approach in understanding language and communication. Peirce and Morris laid essential foundations for the study of pragmatics, unveiling the intricate connections between signs, interpretation, and the contextual nature of communication.

Based on the insights provided by I. Wijana (1992, p. 2) and D. Soeparno (2002, p. 27), pragmatics emerges as a critical facet of linguistics that extends beyond the mere structure of language. It delves into the contextual intricacies, acknowledging that meaning is intricately tied to the context in which communication occurs. Wijana emphasizes the external interpretation of lingual units, highlighting the importance of context in understanding meaning, particularly focusing on the speaker's intentions. Meanwhile, Soeparno underscores the social application of language, considering the situational factors, conversational objectives, and the dynamic between speakers.

From these perspectives, pragmatics appears as the lens through which language is viewed not just as words or grammar, but as a tool deeply embedded in social interaction. It investigates how meaning is constructed, conveyed, and interpreted within a specific context, bridging the gap between what is said and what is understood.

The concept of pragmatics, as delineated by F. Batsievich (Бацевич, 2011, p. 31), encompasses an extensive examination of the **internal realms** that shape communication. Batsievich's definition captures the intricate tapestry of emotions, beliefs, cultural influences, and subjective factors that interweave within language use.

Linguistic pragmatics, according to F. Batsievich (Бацевич, 2016), isn't merely confined to surface-level analysis; rather, it delves deep into the subjective, human element present across all facets of language. Batsievich's emphasis on the absence of rigid methodologies or predefined areas for analysis underscores the dynamic and evolving nature of this field.

The concept of pragmatics, as highlighted by I. Karamysheva, revolves around the notion that pragmatics encapsulates the underlying intention behind generating an utterance. According to Karamysheva (2004, p. 128), pragmatics involves the expression of intent as the driving force behind **speech acts**.

In essence, this perspective underscores that **communication** isn't solely about conveying words or structures but hinges on the purpose or motive behind each expression. Pragmatics, therefore, scrutinizes the motives, contexts, and implications surrounding language use, emphasizing that meaning goes beyond the literal interpretation of words.

In Western linguistics, the term “linguistic pragmatics” has evolved from its Cartesian origins to embrace non-Cartesian, discursive pragmatics, as discussed by F. Bosco (2004). This evolution marks a pivotal shift in linguistic discourse methodologies. By integrating communicative and cognitive paradigms, as highlighted by A. Prykhodko (Приходько, 2008) and I. Shevchenko (Шевченко, 2005b), this framework has profoundly impacted contemporary linguistic processes.

This statement acknowledges the **evolution** of linguistic pragmatics and its broader implications in linguistic analysis. It emphasizes the shift from a structural view of language to a more contextually embedded understanding, highlighting the importance of pragmatics in deciphering the complexities of communication.

In the contemporary understanding of linguistic acts within pragmatics, the focus centers on speech-discursive interaction. This involves **verbal exchanges** between speakers and listeners aimed at achieving specific goals through the construction of meaning during communication, as described by I. Shevchenko (Шевченко, 2005а, р. 116). This perspective emphasizes the **collaborative** nature of communication, where the interaction between communicants is fundamental, moving away from the classical speech act theory, which primarily focused on individual speakers. Additionally, it highlights the integration of speech activity within a broader discursive context, emphasizing its connection to the cognitive-communicative activities of speakers.

Central to this notion is the idea that the realization of a speech act necessitates an addressee, a concept recurrently hinted at in Searle's works. Searle's perspective supports the hypothesis that a speech act forms the fundamental unit of communication, emphasizing the intricate relationships between the intended meaning of the speaker, the linguistic elements used, the understanding by the listener, and the rules governing these linguistic elements (Searle, 1971, р. 36).

Pragmatics in language revolves around the inherent attitudes of a speaker embedded within linguistic components like words, affixes, grammar, and sentence structures towards three pivotal aspects: **reality**, **message content**, **addressee** (Бацевич, 2009, р. 33).

These elements, in conjunction with other pertinent factors, intricately weave into communicative categories, encompassing **contextual**, **situational-generalized**, and **channel-dependent** components, among others (Бацевич, 2009, р. 33). Notably, these factors notably mirror the subjective influences within language.

In conclusion, the exploration of the concept of pragmatics and its role in linguistics reveals the intricate interplay between language, context, and

communication. Pragmatics, as a subfield of linguistics, delves into the study of language use in real-life situations, emphasizing the importance of context, social dynamics, and shared knowledge in interpreting meaning.

1.2. Context and its role in understanding pragmatic meaning

Exploring the intricate relationship between language and context is essential in elucidating how meaning is constructed beyond the literal interpretation of words and phrases. Contextual factors encompass a wide array of elements, including the physical environment, social setting, cultural norms, shared knowledge, and the participants involved in communication.

S. Levinson (2008, p. 507) underscores that without **context**, understanding the meaning of speech becomes challenging within the realm of pragmatics. This implies that context acts as a guiding force that shapes and interprets the intended meaning behind linguistic expressions. R. Asher's observation underscores the ubiquity of context in language but highlights the paradox where its significance is frequently assumed rather than explicitly addressed. This signifies the importance of acknowledging and delving into the layers of context to grasp the intricacies of pragmatic meaning (Asher, 1994, p. 731).

The role of context in understanding **pragmatic meaning** is profound and multi-layered. G. Yule (1996, p. 21) simplifies context as the physical surroundings in which words are used. This implies that the context in which a word or phrase is employed can significantly influence its interpretation and expand its potential range of meaning. For instance, the same word might carry different connotations or implications depending on the context in which it's used.

Moreover, J. Mey (1993, p. 39-40) extends the concept of context beyond mere reference. Context, according to Mey, transcends a straightforward understanding of what things are about. It encompasses not just the immediate physical environment but also the **social, cultural, and situational** factors that shape communication. This broader view of context emphasizes its role in shaping the implied meanings, intentions, and nuances within language use.

As E. Subroto (2008, p. 511) delineates, context is **not static**; it's constantly evolving during speech acts. It involves the immediate environment, the relationship between speakers, and variables like power dynamics, social status, age, gender, and psychological states—all of which contribute to how language is interpreted. Furthermore, context delves into the participants' presuppositions, background knowledge, schemas, and implicatures, illustrating the depth of factors impacting communication.

Contexts in understanding pragmatic meaning encompass two typical markers: **situational** and **cultural** contexts. Situational context relates to the physical environment and the place where language is utilized, representing a more static concept. On the other hand, the global context model assumes a constant context for the entirety of the text, emphasizing that context precedes action (Pranowo, 2020, p. 257). This perspective of **static** context views it as an external reality capable of explaining meaning beyond semantics, a pre-existing factor in verbal communication, and shared knowledge integral to comprehension.

Dey's perspective emphasizes the expansive nature of context, highlighting its significance in influencing how individuals perceive and interpret communication (Dey, 2017, p. 249-250). It underscores the dynamic interplay between contextual elements and the construction of meaning, emphasizing that context isn't limited to the immediate environment but extends to include any information deemed relevant to the interaction.

This understanding of context aligns with the essence of pragmatics, emphasizing the role of context in shaping the pragmatic meaning of linguistic expressions. It reinforces the notion that effective communication hinges not only on the words used but also on the contextual information that surrounds and informs these words.

Context, as described by I. Kochan, is a crucial component that extends beyond mere textual or lexical elements in communication. It encompasses a comprehensive semantic framework that aids in deciphering the intended meaning of words, expressions, or sentences (Кочан, 2008, p. 45). This view emphasizes that

context goes beyond **grammatical structures**, delving into the **stylistic** and **functional** aspects of language elements. Kochan's perspective highlights how context plays a pivotal role in reconstructing pragmatic information that might not be explicitly conveyed within the text itself.

T. Sidorenko further elaborates on this idea by suggesting that words possess both cognitive and pragmatic meanings, with the potential for these meanings to shift or expand based on contextual conditions and speech situations (Сидоренко, 2017, p. 33). This notion underscores the dynamic nature of linguistic expressions, acknowledging that words can acquire various pragmatic senses contingent upon their interaction with the surrounding context and the specific communicative setting.

In summary, the exploration of context and its role in understanding pragmatic meaning has illuminated the intricate dynamics that shape the interpretation of language in real-world scenarios. Context, as a multifaceted concept, emerges as a critical factor influencing the pragmatic meaning of linguistic expressions. By acknowledging the multifaceted nature of context, we are better equipped to unravel the intricacies of pragmatic meaning in diverse communicative settings.

1.3. Means of expressing pragmatic meaning in utterances

The means through which pragmatic meaning is conveyed in utterances represent a fascinating realm within the study of linguistics. In this section, we delve into the diverse mechanisms and tools utilized in language to express pragmatic meaning. Understanding how speakers go beyond literal interpretations and employ various linguistic strategies to convey intended meanings is pivotal in unraveling the complexities of communication.

The foundation of speech act theory underscores the idea that meaning in language goes beyond the words themselves; it's about how language is used in human activities. This concept acknowledges that every **utterance** not only conveys information but also performs an action, be it a request, statement, or question. H. Grice's conversational implicature theory further expanded this by outlining

principles guiding effective communication. Grice's Cooperative Principle, governed by four maxims, forms the core of this theory (Grice, 1989, p. 41-42).

- 1) **Maxim of Quantity.** Share enough information, avoiding excess or insufficient details.
- 2) **Maxim of Quality.** Offer truthful information.
- 3) **Maxim of Relevance.** Stay pertinent to the ongoing topic.
- 4) **Maxim of Manner.** Communicate clearly, avoiding ambiguity or unnecessary complexity.

Grice's work highlights the intricacies of how people communicate beyond literal meanings, showing that speakers often imply more than what is explicitly said to achieve effective communication. This theory has been instrumental in understanding how context, intention, and shared knowledge shape the pragmatic meaning in utterances.

The way speakers convey their intentions goes beyond just the words they choose. It involves a deliberate orchestration of language elements-lexical choices, grammar structures, style, and even the way sentences are constructed. All these components work together to add layers of meaning, going beyond the surface content of what's said or written (Савчук, 2018, p. 259).

Each communicative **sentence type**, such as declaratives, questions, commands, and wishes, possesses unique characteristics that extend beyond a simple binary classification. For instance, declaratives convey statements of fact, while interrogatives seek information, imperatives express commands, and optatives convey desires or wishes (Сірко, 2011, p. 12). These distinctions in structure and semantic function defy a simplistic categorization into just two overarching groups.

J. Searle's breakdown of utterances into three distinct components provides a framework for understanding the layers of communication beyond literal meanings. The **illocutionary act**, at its core, is about conveying information and expressing the speaker's intention (Searle, 1965, p. 231).

In simpler terms, the illocutionary act deals with the transmission of information, while the perlocutionary act involves the hidden motive behind the

message, intending to evoke specific reactions or influence the listener's response. These components work together, shaping the pragmatic nature of communication by going beyond what is explicitly stated (Воробкало, 2021, p. 199).

L. Bezuhla (Безугла, 2020) identifies various speech acts as means of expressing pragmatic meaning in utterances: **assertive**, **directive**, **commissive**, **interrogative**, **expressive**, **contactive**, and **eative** acts.

These speech acts represent different intentions or functions behind utterances. Assertive acts involve stating or affirming something, directives aim to get the listener to do something, commissives commit the speaker to a future action, interrogatives seek information, expressives convey the speaker's feelings or attitudes, contactives aim to establish or maintain social contact, and eatives involve offering or providing something.

The conveyance of ideas through language relies on a multitude of factors that inform a communicator's linguistic choices. These factors, often operating at a subconscious level, encompass various elements shaping communication dynamics. These include the communicator's intentions, the desired impact of the message, chosen communication **strategies**, conversational **style**, shared understanding, and the nature of the **relationship** between communicators (Сітко, 2011). Of these, the communicator's intention stands as the cornerstone, directing the expression towards achieving a specific outcome or effect. Together, these elements collectively define the pragmatic direction of verbal expression.

Expressing pragmatic meaning in utterances involves employing linguistic acts that serve as integral **components** of communication. When thoughts are verbalized, it becomes a multifaceted process that encompasses various stages, often referred to as acts. A speech act embodies several characteristics: **verbal**, **procedural**, **conventional**, **intentional**, **creative**, and **social**, that collectively shape the communication process (Воробкало, 2021, p. 115).

Context isn't just about the sounds or immediate surroundings; it extends to the entire framework of activities and interactions in which communication occurs. It involves the social, cultural, and situational elements that influence and shape the

way language is used and understood. This holistic view emphasizes that communication is not solely about the words spoken but is deeply intertwined with the setting, the participants involved, and their shared knowledge and practices (Hasan, 1986, p. 6).

Interlingual context zooms in on language-specific elements that influence communication. It focuses on linguistic components particular to a language and how they affect understanding (Cook, 2003).

Meanwhile, the **extralingual contexts** are any contexts outside the language which determine meaning (the speaker's meaning) (Brown & Yule, 2013). Such extralingual contexts are referred to by Dijk (2009) as the communicative situation stated as episodic memory (episode of speaker's long-term personal experiences).

In conclusion, the examination of the means of expressing pragmatic meaning in utterances has provided valuable insights into the diverse and nuanced strategies employed by speakers to convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words.

Conclusions to Chapter One

The examination of the concept of pragmatics has elucidated its pivotal role in linguistic inquiry. Pragmatics, as a subfield, extends beyond the traditional focus on grammar and semantics to delve into the dynamic aspects of language use in context. Understanding how speakers convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words is essential in unraveling the complexities of communication.

The exploration of context has revealed its multifaceted role in shaping pragmatic meaning. Context, encompassing linguistic, situational, social, and cultural dimensions, emerges as a critical factor in interpreting utterances.

Speech acts, conversational implicature, and presupposition showcase the versatility of language in performing actions, implying meanings, and making shared assumptions.

These insights underscore the richness and complexity of communicative exchanges, setting the stage for a detailed examination of specific linguistic phenomena in subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

ANALYSIS OF THE PRAGMATIC MODIFICATION OF THE UTTERANCE IN THE MODERN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

2.1. The influence of linguistic context on pragmatic meaning

Pragmatics, as a field of study, acknowledges that the interpretation of language extends beyond its literal meaning and is heavily influenced by various contextual factors. The linguistic context surrounding an utterance plays a pivotal role in shaping its **pragmatic interpretation**, encompassing elements such as the speaker's intentions, the relationship between **interlocutors**, **cultural norms**, and **situational context**. By examining how linguistic context informs the pragmatic meaning of utterances, we gain valuable insights into the complexities of communication and the dynamic nature of language use.

1) *“With the support and prayers of the American people, we achieved more than anyone thought possible. Nobody thought we could even come close”* (Farewell Address – The White House).

This statement utilizes **pragmatic strategies** to emphasize achievement and resilience in the face of skepticism. The phrase “With the support and prayers of the American people” acknowledges the role of the audience in the speaker's accomplishments, appealing to a sense of communal effort and collaboration. The use of comparative language in “more than anyone thought possible” and “nobody thought we could even come close” serves to underscore the magnitude of achievement, contrasting initial doubts with actual outcomes. This pragmatic use of language aims to inspire confidence and highlight the speaker's **leadership capabilities**.

2) *“We have to win.... And the good news is that we are winning the argument”* (British Political Speech | Speech Archive).

This statement utilizes pragmatic strategies to convey determination and optimism within a **persuasive context**. The imperative “We have to win” emphasizes a sense of urgency and necessity, framing the subsequent discourse

within a narrative of goal attainment. The use of ellipsis in “We have to win...” creates a pause, drawing attention to the importance of the message. The assertion “we are winning the argument” employs present tense and first-person plural pronouns to foster a sense of solidarity and collective achievement. Additionally, the phrase “the good news is” introduces a positive spin, reinforcing the speaker's confidence in the ongoing progress of the argument. Overall, this statement employs **pragmatic language** to motivate action and instill confidence in the audience.

3) “*You’re pretty much my favourite person of all time in the history of forever*” (Hattenstone, 2022).

This statement employs **hyperbolic language** within the context of media discourse to express extreme admiration or affection. The use of superlatives such as “favourite person of all time” and “history of forever” exaggerates the speaker's sentiment, emphasizing the depth of their admiration for the addressed individual. The informal tone and **colloquial language** contribute to a sense of intimacy or familiarity, making the statement more engaging for the audience. Overall, this statement employs hyperbolic language to convey a strong positive sentiment within a casual conversational style.

4) “*Yeah, I was making loads of money. And I was probably the most expensive personal trainer in the country. One woman would pay me at least two months upfront, £70 an hour. That was in the early 90s. I learned the more expensive you are, the more demand there is for you*” (Hattenstone, 2022).

This statement reflects a boastful tone within the context of media discourse, emphasizing financial success and **professional achievement**. The use of colloquial language such as “loads of money” and “probably the most expensive” conveys a casual and confident attitude. The speaker's assertion that “the more expensive you are, the more demand there is for you” reflects a perception of value and scarcity within the personal training industry. Overall, this statement employs a boastful tone to highlight financial success and perceived market demand within the speaker's profession.

5) *“I won’t name the company. Huge company, 22,000 employees. What I’m getting at is, I’ve been there and it’s very important that all of us reach down and pick someone up”* (Hattenstone, 2022).

This statement employs **motivational language** within the **context** of media discourse to advocate for supportive behavior within organizations. The speaker's reference to a “Huge company, 22,000 employees” suggests the scale of the organization, highlighting the potential impact of collective actions. The use of the phrase “reach down and pick someone up” employs metaphorical language to convey the idea of offering assistance or mentorship to others. Overall, this statement employs motivational language to promote a culture of support and mentorship within large organizations.

6) *“I really, really, really liked him”* (Green).

This statement utilizes repetition within the fictional discourse to emphasize the speaker's strong **emotional attachment** or fondness towards someone. The repetition of the adverb “really” amplifies the intensity of the sentiment, indicating a deep and sincere affection. The use of the past tense “liked” suggests that the speaker is reflecting on a past experience or feeling. Overall, this statement effectively conveys the depth of the speaker's emotional connection.

7) *“You think that’s cool”* (Green)?

This statement from the **fictional discourse** employs interrogative language to inquire about the perceived coolness or approval of something. The use of the question “You think that’s cool?” suggests a casual and conversational tone, indicating a desire for validation or agreement from the listener. The use of the contraction “that's” instead of “that is” contributes to the informal and colloquial nature of the statement. Overall, this statement effectively conveys the speaker's curiosity or interest in the listener's opinion.

8) *“I hardly know you, Augustus Waters. You could be an ax murderer”* (Green).

This statement from the fictional discourse employs **hyperbolic language** to express skepticism or caution towards someone. The use of the hypothetical scenario

“You could be an ax murderer” serves as a humorous exaggeration to illustrate the speaker's lack of familiarity with the person named. The introduction of the character's full name adds a formal tone to the statement, contrasting with the informal nature of the hypothetical scenario. Overall, this statement effectively conveys the speaker's humorous skepticism towards the person addressed.

9) *“It’s gotta be dangerous, storing children with cancer in your heart”* (Green).

This statement from the fictional discourse employs metaphorical language to convey **emotional vulnerability** or risk. The use of the verb “gotta” adds a colloquial and informal tone to the statement, contributing to a conversational style. The metaphor “storing children with cancer in your heart” suggests the emotional burden or responsibility of caring for others, particularly those facing serious health challenges. Overall, this statement effectively communicates the speaker's contemplation of emotional challenges and responsibilities.

10) *“You don't say much, do you”* (Paramount Plus, 2023)?

This statement from the film discourse employs **interrogative language** to express curiosity or observation about someone's behavior. The use of the rhetorical question “You don't say much, do you?” suggests that the speaker has noticed the person's quiet demeanor and is prompting them to respond. The informal and colloquial tone of the statement, along with the use of contractions, contributes to a casual conversational style. Overall, this statement effectively conveys the **speaker's curiosity** about the other person's behavior.

11) *“Hey... dummy”* (Paramount Plus, 2023)!

This statement from the film discourse employs **derogatory language** to address someone in a disrespectful or insulting manner. The use of the interjection “Hey” followed by the derogatory term “dummy” suggests a dismissive attitude towards the person being addressed. The ellipsis before the derogatory term adds emphasis and draws attention to the insult. Overall, this statement effectively conveys the speaker's contempt or disdain towards the person being addressed.

12) *“You can't sit here”* (Paramount Plus, 2023).

This statement from the film discourse employs authoritative language to issue a directive or prohibition. The use of the declarative sentence “You can't sit here” asserts control over the seating arrangement, indicating that the speaker is enforcing a rule or policy. The directness of the statement, along with the use of contractions, contributes to a firm and **assertive tone**. Overall, this statement effectively conveys the speaker's authority and the expectation of compliance with the directive.

13) *“Finishing first on a test is both the biggest flex and the scariest thing at the same time #gaming #college #test #streamer”* (Status Twitter (d)).

This statement from the internet discourse employs **informal language** and internet slang to express a nuanced perspective on academic achievement. The use of the term “flex” (a slang term meaning to show off or boast) in the **context** of academic performance adds a playful and competitive tone to the statement. The hashtags “#gaming” and “#streamer” suggest a gaming or streaming community context, reflecting the interests and identity of the speaker.

14) *“Next week=dead week #college”* (Status Twitter (d)).

This statement from the internet discourse employs concise language and a hashtag to express a common sentiment among college students regarding the upcoming week. The equation “Next week=dead week” succinctly conveys the idea that the following week will be particularly challenging or stressful due to academic demands. The hashtag “#college” situates the statement within the **context** of college life and student experiences.

15) *“This is cray cray”* (Status Twitter (a)).

This statement from the internet discourse employs slang and colloquial language to express a strong emotional reaction. The use of the term “cray cray” (slang for “crazy”) conveys a sense of disbelief or incredulity towards a situation or event. The informal tone of the statement suggests a casual and conversational style of communication. Overall, this statement effectively conveys a humorous or lighthearted reaction to a perceived absurd or unusual circumstance.

In conclusion, the analysis of linguistic context on **pragmatic meaning** reveals the intricate interplay between language structures and situational factors in shaping the intended interpretation of utterances.

2.2. The relationship between sociocultural factors and the pragmatic meaning of the expression

Language, as a social phenomenon, is deeply rooted in cultural contexts, and the way individuals convey meaning is profoundly shaped by the societal and cultural environments they inhabit. By scrutinizing how **cultural norms, societal values, and shared** beliefs impact the pragmatic interpretation of utterances, we aim to elucidate the dynamic relationship between language and culture.

17) The expression “*You’re pretty much my favourite person of all time in the history of forever*” (Hattenstone, 2022) employs hyperbolic language and an informal tone, which is characteristic of contemporary media discourse. The use of such exaggerated language is often influenced by cultural trends in informal communication, where expressions of enthusiasm or admiration are heightened for emphasis. This reflects a **cultural inclination** towards **informal and expressive communication styles**, common in contemporary media.

18) The statement “*I was probably the most expensive personal trainer in the country. One woman would pay me at least two months upfront, £70 an hour*” (Hattenstone, 2022) reflects the intersection of economic factors and cultural attitudes toward personal fitness. The willingness to pay a premium for personal training services, as well as the association between cost and perceived quality (“the more expensive you are, the more demand there is for you”), reveals a blend of economic and cultural values within the fitness industry.

Overall, these expressions from media discourse highlight the intersection of sociocultural factors with language use, revealing underlying attitudes, biases, and values prevalent in the respective cultural and societal contexts.

19) “*I really, really, really liked him*” (Green). The repetition of “really” in this statement emphasizes the depth of the speaker's feelings, reflecting a cultural

tendency towards exaggeration for emphasis. This **linguistic feature** is often used in informal discourse to convey strong emotions, aligning with cultural norms of expressive communication in storytelling and interpersonal interactions.

20) *“I hardly know you, Augustus Waters. You could be an ax murderer”* (Green). This expression reflects a cultural tendency towards humor or exaggeration in fictional discourse. The statement juxtaposes the serious implication of being an “ax murderer” with the casual tone of the preceding sentence, creating a comedic effect. This use of humor is influenced by cultural norms of storytelling and narrative structure in **fictional discourse**.

21) *“I worried the cancer had spread from my lungs.”* (Green). This expression reflects a cultural norm of using medical terminology and metaphors to convey **emotional** or existential concerns. In many societies, discussions about illness and mortality are often metaphorically linked to broader existential themes, reflecting cultural attitudes towards health, mortality, and spirituality.

Overall, these expressions from fictional discourse demonstrate how sociocultural factors shape the pragmatic meaning of language use, influencing the choice of words, expressions, and rhetorical devices in storytelling and narrative construction. Cultural norms, values, and communication styles intersect with linguistic creativity to convey nuanced emotions, attitudes, and interpersonal dynamics in fictional discourse.

22) *“Gump, how can you watch that stupid shit?”* (Paramount Plus, 2023). This question reflects a cultural attitude towards entertainment and personal preferences. The use of colloquial language and the derogatory term “stupid shit” convey a sense of disdain or disapproval, reflecting cultural norms of expressing opinions and preferences in informal settings.

23) *“Are you retarded, or just plain stupid?”* (Paramount Plus, 2023). This question reflects a cultural attitude towards intelligence and mental abilities. The use of derogatory terms and the question itself convey a judgmental attitude towards the intelligence of the individual, reflecting cultural norms of valuing **intellectual abilities** and societal attitudes towards cognitive differences.

Overall, these expressions from **film discourse** reflect a complex interplay between linguistic choices and sociocultural factors, shaping the pragmatic meaning of expression in the context of storytelling and character interactions within the films. Cultural norms, values, and attitudes influence the language used by characters, reflecting broader societal dynamics and cultural perspectives depicted in the films.

24) “*Finishing first on a test is both the biggest flex and the scariest thing at the same time #gaming #college #test #streamer*” (Status Twitter (d)). This statement reflects a blending of gaming culture and academic achievement within the college context. The use of the term “flex” (showing off or boasting) is borrowed from internet and gaming culture, while hashtags like #gaming and #streamer indicate a connection to online gaming communities.

25) “*am deathly ill but still #vibing with the neighbors. caroline kinda smells tbh #livinglife #college #frat #beer*” (Status Twitter (b)). This expression reflects a mix of humor and college culture, influenced by social norms and experiences within fraternity communities. The use of the term “vibing” (enjoying oneself) and hashtags like #college, #frat, and #beer indicate a casual and social atmosphere, while the mention of illness adds a humorous contrast. The statement reflects a **sociocultural context** where socializing and camaraderie are valued, even in less-than-ideal circumstances.

Overall, these expressions from internet discourse reflect a complex interplay between linguistic choices and sociocultural factors, shaping the **pragmatic meaning** of expression in the context of online communication and shared cultural experiences. Cultural norms, values, and attitudes influence the language used in online discourse, reflecting broader societal dynamics and cultural perspectives.

In conclusion, the analysis of the relationship between sociocultural factors and the pragmatic meaning of expressions reveals the intricate interplay between language use and cultural context. Through examining various discourses such as political, media, literary, cinematic, and internet discourse, it becomes evident that sociocultural factors significantly influence the pragmatic interpretation of

expressions. These factors encompass societal norms, values, beliefs, social roles, power dynamics, historical contexts, and technological advancements, among others.

2.3. Linguistic means of modifying pragmatic meaning

The linguistic landscape is rich with diverse tools and strategies that speakers employ to modify pragmatic meaning, allowing for nuanced communication in various contexts. By examining the intricacies of linguistic modification within pragmatic contexts, we gain valuable insights into the dynamic nature of language and its role in shaping **interpersonal interactions, social dynamics, and cultural norms**.

In the **political discourse** examples provided:

26) *“When our politics becomes polarised, and compromise becomes a dirty word, that becomes harder. And good people are put off public service. It doesn’t have to be this way”* (Political Speech). Here, the pragmatic meaning is modified through the use of metaphors (“politics becomes polarised,” “compromise becomes a dirty word”) to characterize the current state of politics. These linguistic devices serve to convey a sense of division and conflict within the political landscape, while also suggesting a negative attitude towards compromise.

27) *“So, let’s rise above the abuse. Let’s make a positive case for our values that will cut through the bitterness and bile that is poisoning our politics. Let’s say it loud and clear: Conservatives will always stand up for a politics that unites us rather than divides us.”* (Political Speech). The pragmatic meaning is shaped through the use of imperative language (“let’s rise above the abuse,” “let’s make a positive case”) and inclusive pronouns (“our values,” “us”) to encourage collective action and solidarity. Additionally, the use of contrasting terms (“bitterness and bile,” “politics that unites us rather than divides us”) serves to highlight the desired outcome and position the speaker’s stance as a preferable alternative.

In the **discourse from the media**:

28) “*You’re pretty much my favourite person of all time in the history of forever*” (Political Speech). The pragmatic meaning is modified through the use of **hyperbolic language** (“pretty much my favourite person of all time in the history of forever”), which exaggerates the speaker's admiration for the addressed person. This linguistic device serves to emphasize the speaker's sentiment and convey a strong emotional connection.

The expressions from **fictional discourse**:

29) “*God, that hurts*” (Green). The use of the interjection “God” adds emphasis and intensity to the statement, conveying a strong emotional reaction to the pain experienced. The pragmatic meaning is modified to emphasize the severity of the discomfort.

30) “*You’re killing my vibe here*” (Green). The colloquial expression “killing my vibe” modifies the pragmatic meaning to convey annoyance or frustration caused by the listener's behavior disrupting the speaker's mood or atmosphere.

In the expressions from movie discourse:

31) “*Hey... dummy*” (Paramount Plus, 2023)! The use of the term “dummy” as an interjection can be interpreted as playful or teasing in tone, modifying the pragmatic meaning to convey a lighthearted or affectionate interaction.

32) “*They gave you an imbecile, a moron who goes on television and makes a fool out himself in front of the whole damn country, the Congressional Medal of Honor*” (Paramount Plus, 2023). This statement employs sarcasm to criticize the recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, suggesting they are undeserving of the honor due to their perceived incompetence. The pragmatic meaning is modified to convey scorn or contempt.

In the expressions from **internet discourse**:

33) “*Next week=dead week #college*” Status Twitter (a). This equation-style expression uses “dead week” to refer to a period of intense studying before exams, modifying the pragmatic meaning to convey the speaker's acknowledgment of academic stress associated with upcoming exams.

34) “*Thursday has never looked so thirsty*” (Status Twitter (a))!! The use of “thirsty” in a figurative sense, meaning eager or desperate, modifies the pragmatic meaning to convey excitement or anticipation about the events or activities planned for Thursday.

In conclusion, the analysis of **linguistic means of modifying pragmatic meaning** has revealed the intricate ways in which language is utilized to convey nuanced implications and contextual nuances. Through various linguistic devices such as lexical choices, figurative language, and syntactic structures, speakers and writers adeptly modify the pragmatic meaning of their expressions to suit specific communicative goals and situational contexts.

Conclusions to Chapter Two

Through the analysis of various linguistic contexts, including political discourse, media discourse, artistic discourse, and internet discourse, it has become evident that linguistic meaning is intricately intertwined with the surrounding context, leading to variations in pragmatic interpretation.

By examining utterances from political discourse and, among others, we have observed how sociocultural factors such as power dynamics, social identities, and cultural norms shape the pragmatic meaning of expressions, highlighting the importance of considering sociocultural contexts in pragmatic analysis.

Through the analysis of linguistic devices such as lexical choices, figurative language, syntactic structures, and discourse markers, we have observed how speakers and writers adeptly modify pragmatic meaning to achieve communicative goals and navigate various situational contexts.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the examination of linguistic context on pragmatic meaning underscores the intricate interplay between language structures and situational factors, shaping the intended interpretation of utterances. This dynamic relationship highlights how speakers deftly navigate and manipulate language across diverse contexts, including political, media-related, artistic, and internet-based domains.

Furthermore, the analysis reveals the profound influence of sociocultural factors on language use, emphasizing the significant impact of cultural context on pragmatic interpretation. Societal norms, values, power dynamics, and historical contexts, among other factors, shape the nuanced meaning embedded within expressions across various discourses.

Lastly, the study illuminates the sophisticated strategies employed by language users to modify pragmatic meaning, employing lexical choices, figurative language, and syntactic structures to convey contextual nuances effectively. These linguistic devices not only demonstrate the versatility of language but also emphasize the importance of considering linguistic intricacies in pragmatic analysis.

In summary, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of the modification of pragmatic meaning in Modern English by elucidating the complex interactions between language structures, contextual factors, and sociocultural dynamics. It offers valuable insights for future studies in pragmatics and discourse analysis, enhancing comprehension of language use in diverse communicative contexts.

RÉSUMÉ

Дослідження на тему “Модифікація прагматичного значення висловлювання в сучасній англійській мові” присвячене аналізу способів модифікації прагматичного значення в сучасній англійській мові. Робота складається з вступу, двох розділів, загальних висновків, списку використаної літератури та ілюстративних джерел.

У першому розділі “**The influence of linguistic context on pragmatic meaning**” розглянуто вплив лінгвістичного контексту на прагматичне значення. Другий розділ “**The relationship between sociocultural factors and the pragmatic meaning of the expression**” присвячений вивченню взаємозв'язку між соціокультурними факторами та прагматичним значенням висловлювання. та розглядає різноманітні лінгвістичні засоби модифікації прагматичного значення.

Дослідження дозволило розкрити важливі аспекти модифікації прагматичного значення в сучасній англійській мові та виявити вплив лінгвістичного контексту, соціокультурних факторів та різноманітних лінгвістичних засобів на сприйняття висловлювань. Курсова робота виявляє важливість вивчення прагматики для розуміння комунікативного процесу та використання мовленнєвих засобів відповідно до контексту та соціокультурного середовища.

Ключові слова: прагматика, контекст, соціокультурні чинники, прагматичне значення, модифікація.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2011). Вступ до лінгвістичної прагматики: підручник. К.: Видавничий центр “Академія”.
2. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2016). Лінгвістична прагматика. *Енциклопедія Сучасної України*. https://esu.com.ua/search_articles.php?id=55505
3. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2009). Лінгвістична прагматика: спроба обґрунтування проблемного поля та дослідницької одиниці. *Мовознавство*, (1), 29–37.
4. Безугла, Л. Р. (2020). Від слова до діла: Лінгвопрагматика дискурсу. Вінниця.
5. Воробкало, В. В., Сітко, А. В. (2021). Аспекти заміни прагматичних функцій при перекладі. *Міжнародний науковий журнал “Грааль науки”*, (7), 197–200.
6. Карамишева, І. Д. (2004). Термін “прагматика” у сучасній лінгвістиці. *Вісник Національного університету “Львівська політехніка”*, 128–131.
7. Кочан, І. М. (2008). Лінгвістичний аналіз тексту. К.: Знання.
8. Приходько, А. М. (2008). Концепти і концептосистеми в когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі лінгвістики. Запоріжжя: Прем’єр.
9. Савчук, Р. (2018). Лінгвістичні засоби експлікації прагматичного значення у заголовках сучасних ЗМІ (за матеріалами регіональних інтернет-видань). *Вісник Львівського університету*, 43.
10. Сидоренко, Т. М., Стороженко, Л. Г. (2017). Структуризація тексту. К.: ДУТ.
11. Сітко, А. В. (2011). Відтворення комунікативної семантики англійських інтерогативних конструкцій у перекладі. Одеса.
12. Шевченко, І. С. (2005a). Когнітивно-комунікативна парадигма і аналіз дискурсу. *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен*, 9–20.
13. Шевченко, І. С. (2005b). Когнітивно-прагматичні дослідження дискурсу. *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен*, 105–117.

14. Asher, R.E. (Ed.). (1994). *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Pergamon Press.
15. Atkin A. (2013). Peirce's Theory of Signs. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Summer. Retrieved from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/peirce-semiotics/>
16. Bosco, F. M., Bucciarelli, M., & Bara, B. G. (2004). The Fundamental Context Categories in Understanding Communicative Intention. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 467–488.
17. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (2013). Introduction: Linguistic Forms and Functions. *Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511805226.003>
18. Cook, G. (2003). *Applied Linguistics (Oxford Introduction to Language Study Series)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
19. Dey, A. K. (2017). Malware Originated HTTP Traffic Detection Utilizing Cluster Appearance Ratio. *International Conference on Information Networking*, 248–253. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICOIN.2017.7899513>
20. Dijk, T. A. van. (2009). Context Theory and the Foundation of Pragmatics. *Nihongoyouron Gakkai*, 10, 1–13.
21. Grice H.P. (1989). Further Notes on Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, 9, 41-57.
22. Hasan R. (1985). *The identity of a text. Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University Press.
23. Kasher A. (1994). Modular Speech Act Theory. *Foundation of Speech Act Theory*, 312–322. Routledge.
24. Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25. Maugham, W. S. (2005). *The moon and sixpence*. London: Penguin Classics.

26. Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Massachusetts: Best-set Typesetter Ltd.
27. Morris, Ch. (1971). *Writings on the General Theory of Signs*. The Hague: Mouton.
28. Pranowo. (2020). The role of contexts in interpreting pragmatic meanings. *Retorika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 13(2), 256–267.
29. Searle, J. (1965). What is a speech act? *Philosophy in America*, 221–239.
30. Searle, J. R. (1971). *Speech acts*. Fr./M. : Suhrkamp.
31. Sinclair, M. (1995). Fitting Pragmatics into the Mind: Some Issues in Mentalist Pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, 509–539.
32. Soeparno. (2002). *Dasar Dasar Linguistik Umum*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
33. Subroto, E. (2008). *Pragmatics and Some Aspects of Research Methods*. Kelana Bahasa Sang Bahasawan Persembahan.
34. Wijana, I. D. P. (1996). *Pragmatics Basics*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
35. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. *British Political Speech* | *Speech Archive*. (б. д.). British Political Speech | Home Page. <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/>
2. *Farewell Address – The White House*. (б. д.). The White House – The White House. <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/farewell-address/>
3. *Green J. The fault of our stars*. Dutton Books. <https://books-library.net/>.
4. *Groom Winston – Forrest Gump*. (б. д.). RoyallLib.com. https://royallib.com/book/Groom_Winston/Forrest_Gump.html
5. Hattenstone, S. (2022). *'The advertisers didn't want a black man doing fitness': Mr Motivator on racism, etiquette and 'horrible' TV stars*. the Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/>
6. Paramount Plus. (2023). *Forrest Gump* [Видео]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ya_zgmvhKuM
7. *Political Speech* | *Speech Archive*. (б. д.). British Political Speech | Home Page. <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/>
8. *Status Twitter (a)*. (б. д.). Twitter.com. <https://twitter.com/DhingraHarshita/>.
9. *Status Twitter (b)*. (б. д.). Twitter.com. <https://twitter.com/iambordyn/>.
10. *Status Twitter (c)*. (б. д.). Twitter.com. <https://twitter.com/jengekulture/>.
11. *Status Twitter (d)*. (б. д.). Twitter.com. <https://twitter.com/PhazedXWizard/>.
12. *Status Twitter (e)*. (б. д.). Twitter.com. <https://twitter.com/shuchicks/>.
13. *Status Twitter (f)*. (б. д.). Twitter.com. <https://twitter.com/solelyallie/>.
14. *Status Twitter (g)*. (б. д.). Twitter.com. URL: <https://twitter.com/Subhankar09M/>.