

## INTRODUCTION

The novelty of the book derives from the necessity of getting to know and analyse the language speakers and, primarily, writers use. As there are no specialized studies that focus on gender differences seen as social interaction, our paper aims at presenting the multifaceted process of constructing gender and analyses the dichotomy between discourse and gender from a pragmatic perspective.

The reasons why we chose this research topic are connected with our desire to provide useful guidance for constructing gender in various writings and to prove that it has a major role within linguistic studies. We reckon that our paper could be useful to researchers or students who want to investigate the acquisition of gender, its manifestations and linguistic consequences. Although the construction of gender is an ever-present topic in pragmatics, there are few studies dedicated to the connection between gender and literary works. In order to provide others with a clearer image of the construction of gender in various writings, it is our responsibility to focus on the main fields of study that constitute the basis of our thesis: pragmatics and sociolinguistics.

In our research we prompted out several methods of investigation such as discourse analysis, the case study

approach (observation, notes, quotations, interpretation), approaches to analysing written discourse, contextualisation, cross-disciplinary research, but also some other descriptive and pragmatic methods.

Once assimilated into the twentieth century pragmatics, the idea of gender fascinates the minds of many philosophers who foresee the fruits of progress in the philosophy of language and believe in a dichotomy between male and female groups. They think that the conditions leading to the development of different cultural systems are related to conversational behaviour often connected with misunderstandings. However, gender focuses on a special situation in which the prevalence of interaction and identity can be in conflict. Social identification has always been connected with speech similarity and, consequently, philosophers of language (e.g. Robin Lakoff) have always tried to investigate the relationship between men, women and language. Numerous researchers analysed various features such as power strategies or interactional dominance, aiming to illustrate the differences between men and women. They also focused on the feedback given in different contexts, the number of interruptions, the use of intensifiers, the way in which politeness is expressed or on the use of linguistic hedges. All these markers, together with linguistic stereotypes, contributed to our representation of a clearer image of speech as concerns social categories in pragmatics. The process of defining pragmatics, both as a notion and as a science, is an intricate one, presenting many difficulties brought forward by the very historical evolution of the concept and by its prominence throughout time. In so far as history is concerned, a precise definition of pragmatics would pose many problems because the very idea of a pragmatic

approach involves a great variety of changes and influences that took place under specific historical conditions. To further reinforce this idea, Nietzsche was equally partial to the conception that “only that which has no history can be defined”, thus pointing out that any attempt to clearly define pragmatics would be futile.

Despite its novelty within linguistic studies, research on pragmatics can be traced back to ancient Greece and Rome where the word ‘pragmaticus’ meant ‘practical’. Nowadays, the current use of pragmatics is associated with the influential contribution of the American doctrine of pragmatism. Charles Morris analysed in *Foundations of the Theory of Signs* (1938) the differences in semiotics and linguistics, claiming that there is a pragmatic interpretation that lies at the root of this dichotomy. He thought that pragmatics was centred upon the relation of signs and interpreters. Later on, in 1975, Grice thought that there were two types of meaning and pragmatics was supposed to focus on the practical part of meaning, the so-called ‘conversational meaning’, thoroughly analysed by Levinson and Leech in 1983. Both pragmaticians aimed at explaining the way in which conversations functioned. Thus, Levinson identified the *Cooperative Principle* in 1975 and Leech formulated the *Politeness Principle* in 1983. According to Green, in 1989, the term ‘pragmatics’ was coined to describe the natural understanding of language.

However, from a linguistic point of view, pragmatics, a subfield of semiotics and linguistics, analyses the ways in which context is connected with meaning. Its purpose is to examine the conveyance of meaning, depicting how language users succeed in overcoming apparent ambiguity. As contrasted with semantics, which is a branch of linguistics devoted

to the study of meaning, pragmatics focuses on the way in which meaning is transmitted. It has been discovered that the transfer of meaning is related both to the linguistic knowledge (vocabulary, grammar) of the auditor or lecturer, and to the background of the discourse, the speaker's intent, etc. Since both semantics and pragmatics deal with 'meaning', the follow-up question would be related to what meaning is. In statements such as: 'Life without love has no meaning'; 'a red light means stop'; 'I did not mean to do it', there are several meanings of the verb 'to mean' and the noun 'meaning'. Thus, pragmatics focuses on all the aspects of meaning that are not portrayed by semantics.

Pragmatics comprises not only conversational implicature, speech act theory, talk in interaction, the politeness principle, the structure of discourse in the work of Searle (1999), Grice (1991) or Austin (1962) and other approaches to language but also its connection with philosophy, linguistics or sociology. While in semantics we refer to the connotations that a sentence might involve, in pragmatics we focus on the interpretations of an assertion. The definition of any phrase is predictable if we take into consideration its grammatical features and the vocabulary used. Conversely, an in-depth analysis of any excerpt cannot be anticipated as it is actually a combination of the significance of the phrase and the study of the intentions of the speaker.

At the same time, pragmatics can also be looked on from different perspectives. It is particularly important to notice that 'meaning', the representative feature of what pragmatics is related to, is not a stable counterpart from a linguistic point of view. Meaning is generated in a dynamic way in the process of effectively using language. That means speakers are not always

able to get to a pragmatic understanding of 'meaning in context' as context is not a fixed element, changing all the time.

The pragmatic stream of thought is widely spread within the frame of the twentieth century ideologies. In other words, the twentieth century is widely regarded as a period where pragmatics, as a subfield of linguistics, begins to fade away, while pragmatism takes its place as the major pattern of thought. Consequently, pragmatics grows and becomes most relevant in linguistic theory, where it becomes more practical and more concerned with the meaning of everyday conversations. In fact, it is with the help of these elements that the twentieth century pragmatics manages to survive.

Pragmatics manifests itself in various ways in research. One of these ways is interlanguage pragmatics, a subfield of pragmatics that tackles with how non-native speakers understand and produce speech acts in that specific language and how their pragmatic competence develops throughout time. Foreign language acquisition is an interesting process worth analysing due to the comparisons that one can make between a learner's pragmatic performance and a native's pragmatic capability. However, despite these differences, there are some pragmatic universals that teachers of foreign languages apply when teaching English as a foreign language and there are some influences that the first language (L1) exerts on the student's second language (L2) acquisition. The distinction between teaching and learning needs no explanation: the former is carried out by the teacher and the latter by the learner. Traditionally, the focus of attention was clearly on the activity of teaching, as if learning was merely a straightforward reflection of the teacher's actions. 'To learn' meant, above all, to react to the instructions provided by the main actor in the

classroom: the teacher. It is only comparatively recently, since the 1970s, that a redefinition of the role and status of the participants in the teaching-learning process has emerged in the language-teaching circles. Some of the most influential factors that led to this change of perspective are: in almost every sphere of education there has been a growing tendency to become more 'learner-centred', as methodologists have come to realize that each person is ultimately responsible for his/her learning and needs to engage his/her personality in the educational process; also, there has been an increasing awareness of the fact that individual learners are different from each other. They have their own personalities, motivations and learning styles and these characteristics affect how learners act in the classroom, the active role which the learners perform in developing their language has also been emphasized by studies of the first language acquisition. These have led to similar work in foreign and second language learning, which has shown the learner to be an active participant in the developmental process. These are only some of the factors that led to the emergence of pragmatics in relation with second-language acquisition research.

Another important element of pragmatics which can be identified in any natural language is ambiguity. Pragmatic ambiguity is the consequence of the lack of intrinsic meaning of sentences that are perceived in linguistics as abstract entities. For instance, idioms, expressions or fixed phrases are always free to various interpretations because they do not have only one meaning, they actually stray from common expressions and words. The ambiguity of language shows the limited power of words and the fact that without context – the speaker's identity – the meaning of the utterance are difficult

to be deduced. For example, the sentence 'Tom saw the man with a green car' could mean that Tom noticed a man who had a green car (syntactic ambiguity). The overall meaning of the sentence is connected with the intent of the speaker and the context of the utterance. Therefore, ambiguity has both positive and negative features. The positive aspects of ambiguity are related to the effect it has on language through irony, humour, puns. The negative ones are usually a burden to communication and it would be ideal to avoid them. From a pragmatic point of view, the positive aspects of ambiguity or 'intentional ambiguity' are a way of enriching the language and making it more expressive.

Therefore, the field of pragmatics marks the analysis of the speaker's meaning, its aim being to infer the speaker's intentions in a given context. There are also some other aspects involved in the presentation of pragmatics, such as the study of implicatures (the speaker's ability to communicate certain beliefs or ideas without actually pronouncing them), the study of the intended meaning as compared to the unsaid (what is not meant to be mentioned). Pragmatism proliferates as a result of all the changes that occur at the level of language and, at the same time, as a result of the context of the utterance by means of the various scientific methods that are introduced to facilitate the functioning of language and to make it easier for speakers. Due to 'the information structure' that shows how utterances are apprehended in order to control the entities between speakers and listeners, language becomes more vivid, expressive and logical for speakers. The information structure tries to answer the question: How do we deliver a presentation or in what order do we present the information in a statement? In English, the presentation of information is inextricably

linked to context and that makes information become pragmatic. There were pragmaticians who claimed that discourse should be rearranged according to specific categories such as newness and givenness. These categories play a very important role in understanding language.

In the circles of language development, three theories of great influence surface as a continuation of the principles laid down by pragmaticians. Consequently, the learning perspective claims that children are imitators of what they see and hear, learning from punishment and reinforcement. The nativist perspective offers another unique overview of learning, arguing that individuals are biologically programmed to acquire information. This perspective belongs to Noam Chomsky, who believes that all human beings have a language acquisition device (LAD). This device enables children to understand the rules of any language they are interested in. Taking into consideration all the 'inherent processes of the human mind', Chomsky develops the concepts of transformational grammar (emphasising the surface and deep structures of language, the way in which inflections work, the way in which case is assigned under government, etc., the binding theory). Moreover, it is Chomsky who revolutionizes language and gives many examples of evolutionary patterns that can also be found in transformational grammar. The third theory, the interactionist theory, suggests that language development is related to both biological and social matters. Therefore, language learning is influenced by the children's wish to communicate with others, the children's brain developing slowly (according to Interactionists) and providing them with the capacity to acquire information that they share with others. The main representative of this theory is Lev

Vygotsky who models the idea of collaborative learning, illustrating how conversations with older people offer both cognitive and linguistic improvement to children.

The idea that pragmatics was the study of aspects of language that require reference to the users leads to their description in philosophy. This means that natural languages require such reference (indexical words). Numerous definitions of the term *pragmatics* have sprung from Morris's clash of semiotics that focused on the study of sociological and psychological phenomena (sign systems or language). The modern use of the term *pragmatics* is associated with the philosopher of language, Charles Morris. Within semiotics, he identified three branches of inquiry: syntax (the study of the relations between signs), semantics (analysing the relations between the signs and the objects to which they can be applied) and pragmatics (aiming to depict the relation of signs to the interpreters). Pragmatics' function is, thus, to predict an action or to solve a problem, all the philosophical topics having practical purposes. However, the restrictive use of pragmatics revolves around the idea that pragmatics should deal with the principles of language usage, having no relation with the description of linguistic structures. According to Chomsky, if we were to think of the dichotomy between competence and performance, we would notice that pragmatics is connected with the performance of language use.

Therefore, pragmaticians claim that a theory of pragmatics would be mostly concerned with the clarification of sentences by the context in which they are uttered. For instance, there are many words that require new interpretations of the text: dislike, irony, etc. It is worth mentioning that contexts do a lot more than choose between several semantic readings of

sentences. While grammar is concerned with the context of the assignment of meaning to linguistic forms, pragmatics is based on the further interpretation of such forms in a given context. Unfortunately, some aspects of linguistic structures may lead to the impossibility of making a clear distinction between context-independent grammar and context-dependent interpretation due to the codification of certain features in a context. Thus, it can be deemed that pragmatics serves two functions: it covers both context-dependent aspects of language structure and the principles of language usage. We can claim that pragmatics is mostly interested in the principles of language usage and the relations between language structures, focusing, at the same time, on the links between language in context that are worth being written in grammars.

In all its complexity, pragmatics can be seen both as a textual description of the mechanisms of language, and as a “study of the language in use” (as Verschueren puts it in his great work *Understanding Pragmatics*) which is connected with meaning and the context in which it appears. Through its textual representations, pragmatics becomes not merely a science placed at the boundaries of semantics and linguistics, but rather an active process of the human intellect because it helps us understand the deepest mechanisms of language and the way in which gender is constructed.

Gender can be viewed as the structural core of all pragmatics, having directly descended from sociolinguistics and bringing us closer to the sense of language as a whole. Traditionally, gender follows two main directions: a socio-linguistic direction and a pragmatic one, both of them relying on conversation analysis. Very often, these conversations are seen as having a unique character, recounting various

problems of language. Pragmatics expands to include a large body of propositional content of utterances, but also hedging, interjections and pragmatic markers, leading to the understanding of the cognitive use of discourse.

On the whole, gender varies according to the forms of language used by women and men. While women use a more standardized language, being more aware of the role of politeness in society, men are more relaxed and more conscious of their prestige. However, we must be aware of the fact that without these distinctions in gender, language would become insipid and some of its nuances would be lost. These distinctions appear as symbolized by variation because the use of pragmatic markers varies according to national variety, age or gender. It was proved that, when women were devalued, so was their language. When they lacked in authority, women were inclined to use more tag questions in their speech, being less confident in themselves. As for men, they use language as a symbol of their dominance and power, as a source of exercising control. Insights centred on knowledge of pragmatics revealed the existence of a new approach (the deficit approach) that actually became the starting point for gender and language studies and a key element in the definition of the relation between gender and language. The analysis of tag questions, new forms or response expressions were used across gender and proved to be highly influential. Afterwards, the dominance approach stated men's dominance and women's subordination in speech. The gender differences regarding inequality across men's and women's language forms were illustrated by the difference approach that analysed more thoroughly the features of the dominance approach.