



A REVIEW ON "UNDERSTANDING PRAGMATICS BY JEF VERSCHUEREN"

Yasin KHOSHHAL¹ & Fereshte Taghi MONTAGHAMI²

ABSTRACT

Examining the mental and social processes involved in communication through language, *Understanding Pragmatic* is a comprehensive introduction to the subject. This book provides an overview of the theoretical basis of pragmatic examines the main theoretical perspectives and explores its methodological aspects. As for the pragmatic in its broadest sense, covering the whole range of social, cultural and cognitive construction of meaning through the use of language aspects. Assuming no background in the pragmatic, the text provides helpful summaries, chapter by chapter for suggestions of reading and research topics for further study. The book tries to address questions such as what do people do when language is used? How exactly the meaning is generated when we communicate? And why do we say when we say something else? This review gives an overall review of the book and seeks to cover the whole concepts that are mentioned; eventually the reviewers have given their comment and conclusion of the book.

Key Words: Pragmatics, meaning, linguistics, language.

Introduction

The present Volume which is under review has 295 pages and it was published in 1999. The author is Jef Verschueren, director of the Research Center of the international Pragmatics Association. The title is *Understanding Pragmatics*. As Verschueren writes in his preface, this book is an attempt to meet a double challenge: (a) *to present a coherent theory of pragmatics, describing research to date and setting parameters for future research*; and (b) *to serve as a textbook that is accessible to all students with a basic linguistics background and those more skilled in the sciences of language*. This textbook focuses on pragmatics in its broadest sense, covering the social, cultural and cognitive aspects. The first section of the book sketches a theoretical starting point for the exposition, making use of a limited prior knowledge of some general linguistic concepts. The second section provides the building blocks for an understanding of pragmatics as a potentially coherent field of inquiry, while the third explores methodological issues with reference to specific practical research questions This book is organized in three parts and nine chapters, but I just want to review six chapters. Part I, 'The pragmatic perspective', mentions the pragmatics idea as a general perspective in the

¹ Language Department, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran, e-mail: jasin.kd@gmail.com

² Language Department, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

language, i.e. as an approach to language that considers the full complexity of its cognitive, social, and cultural functioning. For that reason, Chapter 1, "*Language and language use*", will review a wide range of concepts studied before under the label of pragmatics. Chapter 2, "*Key notions*", will suggest that using language means the continuous making of linguistic choices. Then in order to understand 'choice making', it will introduce three related notions (variability, negotiability, and adaptability). And, it will show how these notions help to understand the previously phenomena. Part II, 'Aspects of the meaningful functioning of language', will help to understand pragmatics as a coherent field of inquiry and will mention the four aspects of the meaningful functioning of language which any pragmatics theory should consider. Each of them will explain in different chapter. Chapter 3, "*Context*", will identify contextual correlates of adaptability. Then, it will discuss that "context" is not a vague notion because contexts are themselves generated and this generation process can linguistically trace. Chapter 4, "*Structure*", will deal with elements of structure and structuring which are the true objects of adaptability. Chapter 5, "*Dynamics*", will look at the dynamics of the processes themselves. Also, it will show how communication principles and strategies are used in the making and negotiating of choices of production and interpretation. Chapter 6, "*Saliency*", will give an account of their status in relation to the cognitive tool to use language communicatively and concern with different manners of processing in the medium of adaptability, the human 'mind in society'. In general, pragmatics was presented as *the linguistics of language use, constituting a general functional (i.e. cognitive, social and cultural) perspective on language*. With as its topic of investigation *the meaningful functioning of language* in actual use, as a complex form of behavior that *generates meaning*.

CHAPTER 01

Language and language use

1.1 common topics in pragmatics

1.1.1 DEIXIS

*One of the first phenomena that scientific consideration of language use could not ignore was the 'anchoring' of language in a real world, achieved by 'pointing' at variable along some of its dimensions. This phenomenon is called Deixis, and the 'pointers' are indexical expressions or indexicals. There are essentially four dimensions involved: time, space, society (in particular the interlocutors), and discourse (the ongoing linguistic activity). Temporal deixis can be used to point to a time. Be careful that there is not mechanical connection between choices of tense and temporal anchoring points because deictic expression can never be taken at face value. Spatial deixis can be used to show location of people and things. And it divided into absolute and relative; it is accessible through the real world information on the basis of fixed positions. Also we should know the speaker's locations as geographical reference point in order to interpret the spatial deixis. Person deixis can be used to indicate people such as *me*, *you*. Also Social deixis anchors language into its immediate interactional context of use. Finally, discourse deixis is involved whenever a form expression points at earlier, simultaneous, or following discourse. Also, discourse deixis may be of a 'self-referential' or*

'reflective kind'. It should be mention that the interpretation of all deictic expressions depends on the context, the speaker's intention.

1.1.2 Speech acts

One of the basic ingredients of pragmatics for a long time that was introduced by Austin is speech acts. *The things one does with words at the structural level of the sentence called speech acts*. For example, asking question. Also, he made a distinction between 'constative' and 'performative' utterance. Austin defined performative in which something is done which cannot be said to be true or false but which can be evaluated along a dimension of 'felicity' and constatives are utterance in which something is said which can be evaluated along a dimension of truth. Although he realized that such distinctions are troublesome. Finally, Austin reached to the point that all utterances contain both constative and performative elements. Thus, he changed the terms into three fold distinctions: '*locutions*' are acts of saying something, including the constative aspects of the speech act; '*illocutions*' are what is done in saying something, such as making promise; '*perlocutions*' are what is done by saying something, for example accounting on the speaker's promise. Searle saw the illocutionary point, i.e. the speaker's intention that the utterance corresponds to a certain act, as the central feature of the illocutionary force, which is in turn an aspect of meaning; illocutionary acts cannot occur without expressing a proposition, and propositional acts cannot occur without some illocutionary act. Accordingly, for the speaker to achieve the intended illocutionary effect, illocutionary acts must satisfy essential felicity conditions: propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, essential. The classification of illocutionary acts stands on all of these dimensions of analysis, and on the essential conditions, on the propositional content, on the sincerity condition. In addition, orthodox speech act theory suggested that all speech act, in any language anywhere in the world, fall into five categories: Assertive, Directives, commissives, expressives, declarations. There is the distinction between 'explicit performatives' and 'primary performatives'. Explicit performatives described the kind of act that is being performed. All other forms of utterance are primary performatives. Note that explicit performative formulae are examples of discourse deixis of the self-referential type. Finally, it is usually assumed that the major sentence types have a typically associated 'literal force'.

1.1.3 Implicit meaning

What can be meant or communicated beyond what is explicitly or literally said, by means of presupposition, implications, and implicatures in other words, a range of meanings emerging from the contextually embedded action character of speech, which could be captured under the term of 'implicit meaning'. '*Presupposition*' is aspects of meaning that must be pre-supposed taken for granted for an utterance to make sense. Also, presupposition is relations between a form of expression and implicit meaning which can be arrived at by a process of 'inference'. The process of inferring meaning in a way that cannot be imagined without taking contextual information into account, there are also inference types that are supposed to lead logically to relations between forms of expression and implicit meaning. These are called(logical)

implications or entailment, or sometimes conventional implicatures. The term implicatures covered a variety of non-explicit meanings such as suggestion, and implications. Also, 'conventional or standard conventional implicature' *is implicit meaning that can be conventionally inferred from forms of expression in combination with assumed adherence to conversational maxims*. The *maxims* are: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. According to Yule (1996) Grice's theory of 'conversational implicature' is implicit meaning inferred from the obvious flouting of a conversational maxim in combination with assumed adherence to the cooperative principle. Not hidden. It is free. Moreover, conversational implicatures have some properties such as *defeasible, calculable, and non-detachable*. Also, conversational implicature *is a model of communication that attaches the highest normative value to demands for rationality and efficiency*.

1.1.4 Conversation

The linguistic interaction between two or more people as coordinated and collaborative social action is called conversation. Also, a set of circumstances in which people interact in some conventional way to arrive at some outcome called speech event.

1.2 What the common topics have in common

These four areas are interrelated and it would be a productive decision to keep them as focal points. Also, two additional domains of research: politeness and argumentation. Politeness is *the strategies employed by language users to protect their own and their addressee's face*. A distinction is made between Negative face, *a person's need to have freedom of action*, and positive face, *a person's need to be treated as an equal or insider*. Negative politeness is an attempt to save the addressee's negative face, while positive politeness is an attempt to save the address's positive face. Also, *argument is the global structuring of discourse to reach specific communicative goals*. 1.3 Genres of language use There are important distinctions to be drawn between different manifestations of language in use by Bakhtin's theory of speech genres. Also, discourse will be used to designate any spoken or written variety of language use. Unlike in some tradition, text will be restricted to written types of discourse. Conversation will be used for any form of spoken discourse involving more than one speaker.

CHAPTER 02

KEY NOTIONS

2.1 Making choices

Language use can be defined as the continuous making of linguistic choices, therefore, language use theory be able to make sense of this 'making of choices'. Three key notions are needed to make sense of the process of making choice. They are *variability, negotiability and adaptability*

2.2 Variability, negotiability, and adaptability

Variability is the property of language which defines the range of possibilities from which choices can be made. It shows the varieties of language. The notion of variability must be taken so seriously that the range of possible choices cannot be seen as anything stable. It is not fixed; rather, it is constantly changing. Negotiability is the property of language responsible for the fact that choices are not made mechanically or according to strict rules or fixed form-function relationships, but rather on the basis of highly flexible principle and strategies. Also, negotiability implies indeterminacy of various kinds. First of all, there is indeterminacy of choice on the side of the language producer. Second, there is indeterminacy of choice on side of interpreter. Whatever is said can be interpreted in many ways, one of the reasons being that choices do not necessarily exclude their alternatives from the world of interpretation. Third, indeterminacy is also involved because choices can be permanently renegotiated whether on the production or on the interpretation side. Then the question is that how it is possible for language to be used successfully for purposes of communication. Adaptability is the property of language which enables human being to make negotiable linguistic choices from a variable range of possibilities in such a way as to approach points of satisfaction for communicative needs. Note that 'communicative needs' does not mean that all needs have to be communicative, also the 'needs' in question can be quite specific and also that 'satisfaction' in the above definition is only approached. At last, adaptability should not be interpreted unidirectional. The three notions that introduced in this section are fundamentally inseparable.

2.3. Four angles of investigation

Adaptability can be used as a starting point to define four angles of investigation, to be combined whenever a linguistic phenomenon is approached pragmatics: Contextual correlates of adaptability, including any ingredient of the communicative context with which linguistic choices are inter-adaptable. Structural objects of adaptability are including structures at any layer or level of organizations well as principles of structuring. The dynamics of adaptability means the unfolding of adaptive processes in interaction. The salience of adaptation processes, the status of those processes in relation to the cognitive apparatus. These four tasks can see as necessary ingredients of an adequate pragmatic perspective on any given linguistic phenomenon. They related to each other as shown in Figure 1. This figure described that a combination of contextual correlates and structural objects of adaptability can be used to define the locus of adaptation phenomena; the dynamics of adaptability unfolds the adaptive processes between context and structure; the salience of adaptation processes refers to the status of the making of those processes in relation to the cognitive apparatus. Verschueren observes that these four tasks for pragmatic investigation are not to be situated at par with each other. Their contributions are not only complementary; they have different functional loads to carry within the overall framework of the pragmatic perspective. This is because the general concern for the study of pragmatics is to understand the meaningful functioning of language as a dynamic process operating on the context-structure relationship at various levels of salience as illustrated below: Figure 1. The structure of a pragmatic theory (Verschueren 1999, p. 67)

CHAPTER 03

Context

3.1 The general picture

As Malinowski said *the utterance has no meaning except in the context of situation*, his observation can be seen as one of the necessary pillar of any theory of pragmatics. There is no language use without the utterance (U) and the interpreter (I), and the functioning of their minds. For the purpose of pragmatics theory they are social 'roles' and functional entities.

3.2 Ingredients of the communicative context

First, contextual correlates of adaptability have to be identified. This means that language choices must adapt the communicative context (Verschueren, 1999). The contextual correlates of adaptation could be sketched as the following figure: Utterer (U) and interpreter (I) are the focal points of the context. Without utterers' and interpreters' participation, and the functioning of their minds, there is no language use. The lines in the figure converging in U and I can be seen as forming "lines of vision". Every aspect of context within the lines of vision can function as a correlate of adaptability. U and I are presented as focal points because the contextual aspects of the physical, social and mental worlds do not usually start to play a role in language use until they have somehow been activated by the language users' cognitive process. U and I inhabit different worlds, but there are some overlaps between those worlds. The perspective differs, and the common background formed by the overlapping area looks different from each different perspectives. It also shows that communicators make different choices to adapt to contexts, with U making production choices while the interpreter is making interpretation choices. The mental world mainly includes utterers' and interpreters' personality, emotions, beliefs, desires, intentions, and motivations. It includes utterer voice and interpreter roles and that is why "mental world" at the base. Social world refers to principles and rules of social situation, social surroundings and situation-surroundings combinations. Communicators must obey theming communication activities. Among all the factors in the social world, culture is of great importance. Time and space are the most visible features in the physical world. Temporal reference is useful to make a distinction between event time, time of utterance and reference time (Verschueren, 1999). While spatial reference is usually relative to perspective, which can be either utterer space or reference space (the latter defined as having a deictic center distinct from the perspective of the utterer). Therefore, the range of all the ingredients of the communicative context goes from aspects of physical surroundings to social relationships between speakers and hearers and aspects of interlocutors' state of mind. In conclusion, the communicators will be affected by all the factors mentioned above when choosing communication types and language. The context here is not a fixed type. According to Verschueren, "*contexts are generated in language use*", therefore, his perspective about context is dynamic.

3.3 linguistic channel and linguistic context

The final contextual objects of adaptability include properties of the linguistic channel that issued and the linguistic context in which the event takes place. The study of linguistic context often goes under the label of cohesion, and other features like intertextuality and sequencing. *The label of cohesion is generally used to designate the overt marking of relations within a discourse or text which is often called-text. Some markers of cohesion include conjunctions, anaphora, juxtaposition, exemplification, ellipsis, comparison, and contrast.* Finally, the sequential properties of linguistic context has been studied in conversation analysis, however, this phenomenon is equally important in other types of language use.

3.4 The generation of context

Contexts are generated in language use, and thereby restricted in various ways. According to Levinson (2003) and based on the comments that he has given on Gumper's ideas about contextualization he asserts that;

the apparently paradoxical idea that utterances could somehow carry with them instructions about how to build the contexts in which they should be interpreted. The two were combined in the idea of a contextualization cue

In other words, contexts are created by the dynamics of interaction between utterers and interpreters in relation to what is 'out there'. Clarifying the importance of context we may refer to what Duranti & Goodwin (1992) have asserted about essentiality of this concept "providing a formal – or simply explicit – definition of a concept [context] can lead to important analytic insights" Three phenomena: lines of vision, the manipulation of contexts, and contextualization which involved in generation process. *The lines of vision determine a language user's positioning vis-à-vis a surrounding 'world' which imposes restriction on the type and amount of world that can be activated. Those restrictions determine the site and the building materials for the context- generation process, both on the utterer's and the interpreter's side.* Also, language users have ability to manipulate contexts by moving in and out of what referred to as *mental spaces*. *Contextualization is one of the most important ingredients in the verbal generation of meaning. Moreover, context contributes to clarity by being subject to negotiation, uptake or rejection, acceptance of uptake or renegotiation, and so on. This process called contextualization.* Gumperz (1992) invented the term contextualization cue to show linguistic signals. At last, two important warnings have to be mention. First, some context may be relevant without being '*mobilized*'. Second, viewing context as generated in language use does not imply *radical constructivism*. Note that radical constructivist would believe that context is always completely constructed or created by the language user such a position, denying the existence of any independent' reality'.

CHAPTER 04

Structure

Pragmatics does not need its own basic units of analysis because linguistic choice-making performs on all levels of structure that show variability of any kind, To consider aspects of the meaningful functioning of language, thus, the processes in question have to be situated with reference to specific structural objects of adaptability. These following topics need to consider.

4.1 Language, codes and styles

First, structural objects of adaptability involve the making of choices at the overarching structural levels of languages, codes and styles. Codes share *distinguishable variants of language, involving sets of choices which are geographically, socially, functionally or situationally based. The range of codes for any given language spoken in a sizable community is infinite.* In fact, code switching, a cover term for language or code alternations, is an extremely common occurrence strategy, especially in oral discourse. Because languages and codes related to places, groups, activities or functions, switching is one of the resources for speakers and addressees to generate the meaning of their social world. It used to show affect and solidarity, or to mark power relationship. In the context of intercultural communication, codes are often called communicative styles. And styles are *variants of a language or code along dimension of formality and informality. All languages are amenable to variable stylistic use, and so are most codes are usually to be found at the informal end of scale like slang, whereas others are typically formal like legalese.*

4.2 Utterance- building ingredients

Second, from the entire range of utterance-building ingredients, the process can be indicated in every layer which includes sound structure (intonation, rhythm, stress, voice quality, etc.), morphemes and vocabulary, clauses and sentences, propositions and supra-sentential units, etc. At the level of sound structure, some sound features like intonation or rhythm is important, because they disambiguate the syntactic structure. For example, intonation can turn statement to question. At the level of morphemes and words, *the more abstract a concept becomes, such as peace, the harder it will become to precisely define the semantic core and the more room there will be for negotiation and manipulation.* At the clause level, one example could be word order. They only reflect the structural habits. They follow grammatical rules of given language. Propositions structurally coincide with clauses or sentences, but we should study separately because the term itself invokes different perspective. Various kinds of meaning ingredients help to modification of the proposition structure that we can use modality. *Modality is an inherently pragmatic phenomenon. A special kind of modality, called evidentially, marks the source of information. Some linguists include negation in the scope of modality that affects propositions.*

4.3 Utterances and utterance clusters

Third, we have to review the functioning of different structural types of utterances and utterance clusters, where the term utterance is served for any stretch of language.

4.4 utterance- building principles

Fourth, we should pay attention to utterance-building principles that help the production and interpretation of utterances and utterance clusters by strategies to establish coherence. All utterances do not say everything. They keep some information implicit such as common knowledge. *It is the case that all sentence- level utterances and all sentences used in the construction of longer utterances lift some elements out of the background to use them as the given information or old information about which something is then said that treat as new information.* Element in utterance building at the supra sentential or discourse level is the establishment of one or more discourse topics. The way in which discourse topics are introduced and developed is often referred to as discourse progression.

4.5 Integrated choice- making

Finally, the way in which actual choice-making involves all the above needs to consider, without neglecting the fact that choices in one area are often co- adaptable with those in another. Moreover, choice- making at different levels of structure and based on varying principle is always interdependent and inter adaptable.

CHAPTER 05

Dynamics

The central task of a pragmatics analysis is to account for the dynamics of meaning generation.

5.1 'Locating' the dynamics of communication

A few important factors such as temporal and social dimension are used to "locating" the notion of dynamics in relation to any aspects of contextual correlated and structural objects of adaptability. The first one is the correlation between dynamics and the *temporal dimension*. At the micro level, the interlocutors' memory imposes the considerable time-related processing constrains and the communicative processing itself involves planning. At the macro level, earlier stages of development of languages and linguistic conventions are no longer readily accessible to the language user. Language, as time changes, is not accidental, but with the dynamic adaptation in language use. The second one is the correlation between dynamics and context since the communication takes place between human beings for *social relationship*. In order to maintain their social status, some factors impact their language use: the group identities, the pace at which information is exchanged, the types of information and the social status, etc. The third one is the correlation between dynamics and structure is

linearity, a powerful constraint in communication phenomenon which does not fully determine the shape of the dynamics of language use. The interlocutors can move back and forth along the basic linear dimension at any stage in the process of meaning generation.

5.2 Activities, events and frames of meaning

Bakhtin (1986) proposed the notion of a "speech genre" i.e. a stable utterance type associated with a sphere of human activity and Wittgenstein (1958) introduced the notion of a "language game" i.e. the whole of activities characterizing the human language behavior. Both notions emphasize on the actual process of language use. Moreover, both concepts focus on "stability" (mainly the product of interpretation processes) and also "variability" (a property of the 'reality' in question), are always interacting in the dynamic generation of meaning. *Speech genres or language games had infinitely variable range which forms the substance of interpreted speech activities or speech events which provide frames of meaning for the negotiation of interpretations.* The dynamic generation of meaning is Central to the process of inter (adaptation) in language use or to the meaningful functioning of language, this happens in the course of activities and events, which provide 'frame of meaning'.

5.3 Strategies of meaning generation

The other aspect of the dynamic generation of meaning is strategies. *The use of strategies of language use which exploit the interplay between explicitness and implicitness in the generation of meaning.* Some examples are the strategic avoidance of explicitness, conversational implicature and the like. It should mention strategies always exist in any type of communication.

5.4 The dynamics of interactive meaning generation

The dynamics of interactive meaning generation will be demonstrated by means of some examples. Four examples were given to illustrate how to the dynamics generation of meaning can be described. The author wants to show that *meaning generation is always dynamics and interactive.* I just mention one of the examples which the author participated in this conversation that took place in the Budapest opera house:

1. Woman :{ *gesticulating* } Pause.....pause. *pointing at watch* } How long?
2. JV: { *slowly articulating* } Ten minutes. { *holding both hands up, fingers stretched* } Ten.

The following exchange is completely information-centered, related to the general speech act categories of a question for information followed by answer. The context of conversation is away that strangers can close to each other just to exchange information thus options are limited and people form hypotheses about each other. Therefore he assumed that the woman was foreigner and he chose foreigner talk then he realized that she was a native speaker of English. This shows that even well-educated people wanted to deform their own language to accomplish the tasks. Obviously, this is adaptability of some sort.

CHAPTER 06**Salience**

In this chapter the author discussed the mental process of meaning generation in language use in relation to the medium of adaptability, i.e. a medium through which people can use language in a variable, negotiable and adaptable fashion. Salience is the general term which inspired by Errington (Verschueren 200). Moreover Joseph Errington argues that the famous Javanese [people from the central and eastern parts of the island of Java, in Indonesia] "speech levels" (which he calls "speech styles") are only a subset of linguistic etiquette. (Errington 1988)

6.1 Mind in society

Social factors do not exist without being interpreted; conversely, abstraction cognition without any social embedded does not exist. In other words, the medium of adaptability shows a *non-dichotomous dual nature*. Its duality is capture by the rough gloss *mind* and *society*. the rephrasing mind in society draws attention to the non-dichotomy. Both the duality and non-duality of the medium of adaptability are clearly in evidence in language acquisition. Hence, social activation and acquisition of the cognitive skills needed to use language for the generation of meaning. The same goes for language related socialization and enculturation.

6.2 Perception and representation, planning, memory

The mental phenomena characterizing this medium of adaptability that are most visibly at work in the meaningful functioning of language are *perception* and *representation, planning, and memory*. In addition to their being determined by the workings of such mechanisms, all meaning-generating processes occupy a specific *status* in relation to the medium of adaptability. In other words, not everything that happens in linguistic behavior has the same place in consciousness. These three types of mental process that contribute to the making of linguistic choices were identified: *Perception and representation* involved processes of categorization, as well as association, abstraction, generalization and reification, all of which contribute to the mapping of semantic space. It should note that these two mental activities are inseparable. One of the basic processes interacting with perception is the process of categorization, *which produces semantic contents organized around prototypes and lexical field structured around cognitively basic level*. Categorizations involves in meaning generation and guide *perceptual input* as well as *communicative output*. A process of *association* is involved in the construction and interpretation of concepts such as *landscape architecture*. *Generalization* is the mental act of attaching general activity to specific facts, in combination with abstraction, is the name of the game when events in America in 1776 and in Iran in 1978-9 are all called *revolution*. And *reification* is accomplished when *culture(or language)* is given its plural form *cultures (or language)*. *Planning* is an intention- and goal-related activity guided by scripts and involved in interpreting as well as uttering. *Memory* is interacting with

categorization schemes and scripts, and manifested in processes in processes of recognition and recall.

6.3 Degrees of salience

These types of processes take place with different *degrees of salience* or different degrees of consciousness which provide them with a different *status Vis-a- Vis* the medium of adaptability. When talking about degrees of salience, we need to make distinction between the actual making of linguistic choices and the contributing mental processes. Some elements in a categorization pattern are cognitively moving salient than others. Also, advance planning showed a higher degree of salience or consciousness than planning on the spot i.e. *the more salient a term is in a categorization scheme, the more easily or automatically it will be retrieved. Similarly, the more carefully an exchange has been in advance, the less conscious processing effort it will need to say the right thing at the right time.*

6.4 Metapragmatic awareness

One specific topic related to the salience of actual choice-making: Metapragmatic awareness may show different degrees of salience. Against the background of a general theory of pragmatics, reflections are formulated on the central role of metapragmatic awareness as a specific manifestation of salience, the status of processes of meaning generation in language use in relation to the cognitive apparatus. First the notion metapragmatic, as used in linguistics, is discussed. Then two ways in which indicators of metapragmatic awareness function in language use are distinguished: Their functioning as anchoring devices locating linguistic form in relation to context, and their functioning as signals of the language users' reflexive interpretations of the activities they are engaged in. Finally, some social implications of metapragmatic functioning are discussed, in particular in relation to language ideologies and identity construction. Reflexive awareness is so central that all verbal communication is self-referential to a certain degree or that there is no language use without a constant calibration (to use Silverstein's term) between pragmatic and metapragmatic functioning. This phenomenon forms the proper domain of *metapragmatic*.

6.4.1 Indicators of metapragmatic awareness

The range of indicators of metapragmatic awareness is not restricted. It includes all of Jakobson's 'shifters', Gumperz's 'contextualization cues' (such as instances of code switching), anything ever discussed under the labels 'discourse markers/ particles' or 'pragmatic markers/ particles' (such as *anyway, actually, undoubtedly, I guess, you know* etc.), 'sentence adverbs' (such as *frankly, regrettably*), hedges (such as *sort of, in a sense*), instances of 'mention' vs. 'use' (again as already suggested by Jacobson), as well as direct quotations, reported speech. The label 'metapragmatic' has been used to describe specifically the linguistic study of one category of indicators of metapragmatic awareness, namely

'metapragmatic terms' or – more specifically still – 'linguistic action verbs'(Verschueren 1985a, 1989b; Verschueren (ed.) 1987; Kiefer & Verschueren (eds.) 1988).

6.4.2 Metapragmatic and the nature of linguistic action

Language use, just like other forms of social behavior, is interpreted by the actors involved. As Winch (1958) said, *the property that it is always 'meaningful' in the sense that is interpreted by the actors engaged in it*. In other words, in social life, *conceptualizations* and *practices* are inseparable. In general, in the realm of social life more or less coherent patterns of meaning which are felt to be so commonsensical that they are no longer questioned, thus feeding into taken for granted interpretations of activities and events, are usually called ideologies. Similarly, when elements of metapragmatic awareness can be seen to form persistent frames of interpretation related to the nature and social functioning of language which are no longer subject to doubt or questioning, it becomes possible to talk about ideologies of language, i.e. Habitual ways of thinking and speaking about language and language use which are rarely challenged within a given community. Language users know more or less what they are doing when using language. Self-monitoring, at whatever level of salience, is always going on. And some of the most obvious manifestation of this process is hesitation, and repairs.

Conclusion

First of all, this book had a general review of common topics in pragmatics, including deixis, speech acts, implicit meaning (presupposition, implicature, and the like), and conversation. Then it argued that the interdependence between the common topics is an attempt to formulate more coherent theoretical framework to capture relevant aspects of language use. Key notions for such a framework will be proposed (variability, negotiability, and adaptability). Also, it discussed the ingredients of speech events (ranging from properties of utterer and interpreter to linguistic channel and linguistic context) that see as relevant contextual parameters. It also mentioned detailed overview of structural layers of language that pragmatic processes can see to operate (from choices of language, code, and style to minute details of sound structure). Finally, it talked about types of activity and event, and sample analyses showing the dynamics of interactive meaning generation and paid attention to the cognitive tools and mechanisms available for people to use language adaptability for communicative purposes. According to author, Chapters 3 to 6 provide the "nuts and bolts" of pragmatics, the concepts we need to *do pragmatics*. By way of conclusion, I would like to draw the attention once more to the idea of Verschueren that metapragmatic awareness helps to the generation and negotiation of meaning that is the core process of what language use is all about. This is not only the case at the obvious levels of conscious self-monitoring and audience design, but also at much lower levels of salience where it underlies and contributes to the meaning of most aspects of linguistic choice making. One point worth pointing out is that Verschueren argues and identifies four clear tasks to pragmatic descriptions and explanations these four 'angles' of investigation, which should be seen as focal points in one coherent pragmatic approach to language use. It is important to note at this juncture that pragmatics is interdisciplinary in origin and nature. 'Pragmatics', whether

as a component of a linguistic theory or as a new kind of theory of linguistic communication, has to rely on close cooperation with other disciplines such as sociology, psychology, philosophy, logic and mathematics, information and system theory, Jurisprudence, literary science etc. (Verschueren,1999:262).

Final comments

In recent times, many would argue that we cannot really understand the nature of language itself unless we understand pragmatics: how language is used in communication. For instance, Verschueren observes that "the once popular 'waste-basket' view of pragmatics (Bar-Hillel,1971), assigning to pragmatics the task of dealing with whatever syntax and semantics could not properly cope with, will be radically left behind."(1999:11).This is no easy task, but Verschueren has managed to write a book that is accessible to then on-specialist student and also provides a valuable synthesis of the pragmatic perspective for language specialists in a variety of disciplines. This is a great book. In it examining the mental and social processes involved in communication through language, Understanding Pragmatics is a comprehensive introduction to the subject. This book provides an outline of the theoretical basis of pragmatics examines its major theoretical perspectives and explores its methodological issues. Looking at pragmatics in its broadest sense, it covers the whole range of social, cultural and cognitive aspects in constructing meaning through language use. Focusing on pragmatics in its broadest sense, this text covers social, cultural and cognitive aspects. After sketching the theoretical starting point, an understanding of pragmatics as a field of inquiry is given and the methodological issues explored with reference to specific practical research. This is the most comprehensive and current introduction to pragmatics. Presupposing no background in pragmatics, the author sketches out the theoretical basis of the subject and systematically develops the major theoretical perspectives, to provide a full description of pragmatics as a coherent field of inquiry. The text explores methodological issues, guiding the reader into the existing spectrum of pragmatics-related work. Based on Verschueren's adaptation theory, Yu Guodong (2001) localizes the adaptability of Chinese and English code-switching and creatively came up with the Adaptation Model. According to Yu Guodong's Adaptation Model for Chinese/English code-switching, the reason why communicators choose two or more languages in the same communicative discourse is that they want to adapt to the linguistic reality, the social conventions, or the psychological motivations so as to reach the particular communicative goal. As Yu Guodong claims that pragmatic model is intended to offer a better answer to the question of what people do when switching codes, or what they do by means of switching codes. Therefore, the characteristic of pragmatics is that all the language processes are dynamic, and it combines the phenomena of language description and explanation and it shows the language dynamic process. Reviewers' overall impression with the Handbook of Pragmatics is that it reflected the latest developments of the pragmatics field. By the way, this Handbook appears to devote full investigation on pragmatics. According to the authors of this review the chapter-by-chapter summaries, suggestions for further reading would be helpful for students like *me* that did not have any background in Pragmatics because they helped me a lot in order to get the main

idea of each chapter. Also, most chapters are followed by suggestions for future research and additional reading that would be useful for further reading. Another comment I would like to make is that the author illustrated efficient instances for every term or concept which was a positive point. For example, the dynamics of interactive meaning generation demonstrated by means of some examples.

Reference

- Embugushiki, A.(2010). *Pragmatics*. An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal. 4 (4).
- Errington, J.J. (1988). *Structure and style in Javanese: A semiotic view of Linguistic Etiquette*. University of Pennsylvania Press. Philadelphia: United States.
- Duan, X., Ren, S.(2013). *The Adaptive Studies on Teacher's Roles in Bilingual Classroom Teaching. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 3(11). 2010-2015,
- Duranti, A. & Goodwin, Ch. (1992). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge: United Kingdom.
- Gumperz, J. (1992). *Contextualization and Understanding*. Stanford University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2003). *Contextualizing 'contextualization cues'*. In S. Eerdmans, C. Prevignano, & P. Thibault (Eds.), *Language and interaction: Discussions with John J. Gumperz* (pp. 31-39). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Moyer, M.G. (1996). *Pragmatics a state of the art. A talk with Jef Verschueren*. Links and letters.127-140
- Verschueren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Verschueren, J. (1995b) *Metapragmatics*. In J. Verschueren, J.-O. Östman & J. Blommaert(eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics: Manual*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 367-371.
- Verschueren, J. (2000). *Notes on the role of metapragmatic awareness in language use*. International Pragmatics Association. 440-453.
- Winch, P. (1958). *the idea of a social science and its Relation to Philosophy* (Second Edition). Routledge. London: United Kingdom
- Yu Guodong (2001). *The research on English/ Chinese code switching An Adaptation approach*. Shanxi Renmin Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Ziran, H. Guodong, Y. (2001). *Researches on Code switching*. *Modern Foreign Language*,24(1), 86-95.