

Orazbekova Z.S.

PhD ass. professor, Suleyman Demirel University,
Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: zerainura67@mail.ru

FUNCTIONAL SEMANTICS OF IRONIC PRONOUNCEMENTS IN MEDIATEXTS

The article is devoted to the problems of clarifying the functional semantics of ironic manifestations in mass media. Throughout the whole history of its nature, irony has received a huge number of forms, that until now there has never been a classification that defines a clear line between irony and categories. The meaningful heterogeneity of the text with its ironic direction has the particularity that it is created by the journalist intentionally, with the aim of provoking a certain stylistic effect. The article is devoted to research functional semantics of ironic excerpts in mass media and their linguistic backgrounds, which they express. The opening of this concept of irony, describes by the identification of irony as a content conceptual category of text, allowing the journalist to come up with an emotionally-valued attitude to the displayed reality.

Key words: Ironic pronouncements, media text, publicism

Оразбекова З.С.

PhD, қауымд. профессор, С. Демирел атындағы университет,
Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: zerainura67@mail.ru

Медиа мәтіндердегі ирониялық сөздердің функционалдық семантикасы

Мақала бұқаралық ақпарат құралдарындағы ирониялық көріністердің функционалдық-семантикасын нақтылау мәселелеріне арналған. Бұл саланы зерттеуді әртүрлі кезеңнің теоретиктері айналысқанымен, осы құбылыстың лингвистикалық және стилистикалық жағы әлі күнге дейін назардан тыс қалып келді. Мәтіннің ирониялық бағытымен мазмұнды түрде әртүрлі болуы, оны белгілі бір стилистикалық әсерді тудыру мақсатында журналист қасақана жасайтын ерекшелігімен қатар, эмоционалды әрекеттің маңызды эмоционалды мүмкіндіктерін бағалаудың нысаны ретінде, иронияны түсінудегі журналистика ұстанымымен тығыз байланыс орнатады. Мақала бұқаралық ақпарат құралдарындағы ирониялық үзінділердің функционалдық семантикасын және олар айтқан лингвистикалық ерекшеліктерін көрсетуді мақсат тұтады. Бұл ирония ұғымы мен мәтінін мазмұндық тұжырымдамалық санат ретінде сәйкестендіреді және бейнелеген шындыққа эмоциялық тұрғыда құндылық деп қарауға мүмкіндік береді.

Түйін сөздер: ирониялық мәлімдеме, медиа-мәтін, публицистика.

Оразбекова З.С.

PhD, асс. профессор, Университет имени С. Демиреля,
Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: zerainura67@mail.ru

Функциональная семантика иронических высказываний в медиатекстах

Статья посвящена проблемам уточнения функциональной семантики иронических высказываний в медиатекстах. Хотя изучением иронии занимались теоретики различных эпох, до сих пор лингвистическая и стилистическая сторона этого феномена оставалась за рамками их внимания. На протяжении всей истории своего существования ирония принимала огромное количество форм, что до сих пор так и не появилась классификация, определяющая четкую границу между иронией и смежными категориями. Смысловая неоднородность текста с иронической направленностью имеет ту особенность, что она создается журналистом преднамеренно, с целью вызвать определенный стилистический эффект и обнаруживает теснейшую связь с позицией журналиста

его пониманием мира. Данная статья нацелена показать функциональную семантику иронических высказываний в медиатекстах и их языковых средств, которыми они выражаются. Здесь, помимо раскрытия самого понятия иронии, описывается выяснение иронии как содержательной концептуальной категории текста, позволяющей журналисту передать эмоционально-оценочное отношение к отображаемой действительности.

Ключевые слова: иронические высказывания, медиатекст, публицистика.

Introduction

In modern media texts, ironic statements began to be given special attention by the speakers of mass communications, sociologists, psychologists. These are public statements of politicians, scientific and political articles, newspaper and public texts, and so on. Before proceeding to the disclosure of the essence of the concept of irony, it should be taken into account that each of these versions of the discourse has its functions and linguistic peculiarities. At the present time, the understanding of irony as one of the types of tropes is reflected in all linguistic and explanatory texts. For example: 1) a trail that is used in the use of a clause in the opposite sense with the purpose of a thin or hidden mockery, deliberately clothed in the form of a positive characteristic or glory; 2) mocking use of the word in the opposite sense; 3) a rhetorical figure in which words are used in the meaning of a mockery, covered with a serious form of expression or externally positive evaluation. Nevertheless, this traditional interpretation of irony is somewhat simplistic and leads more quickly to the level of everyday communication and the phenomenon of irony in living conversational speech in it does not pay attention to the peculiarities of the functioning of irony in the publicistic text. Although the irony in the political text can manifest itself in the form of a path and used as a style of reception, its important role in the text is much more significant. We can talk about the two types of irony of two basic approaches to its study, which reflects the philosophical literary criticism and some encyclopedic interpreters that significantly broaden the notion of irony. These are: 1) *antifraz*, when the word or statement acquire in the context of speech a value opposite to the literal meaning or denying it. The irony is usually an expression of ridicule with a view to the allegory, and they refer to the trails less often – to the figures of the stylistic; 2) *an ideologically emotional assessment*, which assumes a critical attitude to the image being portrayed under grave seriousness or praise. More clearly reflects the essence of irony; the definition is contained in a big Soviet encyclopedia. And also, *in the style*: 1)

expressing a mockery or cunning, an allegation when the word or statement acquire in the context of speech a value opposite to the literal meaning or denying it, standing under the doubt. The irony of this reproach and contradiction under the mask of approval and the agreement is deliberately attributed to the phenomenon, which does not exist in it, but which should have been expected. The hint of pretending to be a «key» to irony is usually not in the sense, but in the context or in intonation, and sometimes only in the situation of presentation. Irony is one of the most important styles of humor in the satire of the grotesque. When the ironic mockery is crooked by an evil, caustic mockery, it is called sarcasm; 2) In aesthetics – a kind of comic ideological and emotional assessment of an elementary model or a prototype of which is the structure-expressive principle of verbal stylistic irony. The ironic attitude presupposes the emergence or the emergence of skepticism or ridicule deliberately hidden but defining the style of an artistic or publicistic work or the organization of imagery (the character of the plot). The cover of the joke of the mask of seriousness distinguishes irony from humor and especially from the satire. In this definition, in the sense of irony as a typical method, great attention is paid to the context, without which it is impossible to implement and decode the irony and is also indicated by the style reception of what exactly can be irony-humor of the satyr grotesque. In the definition of irony as an esthetic category, various functions of irony are realized, which are realized in the system of the whole text, and also a very important link of this type of irony with the style of the work is given, in order to create a certain character or to structure the composition of the composition of the work. Having looked through all the history and various approaches to the definition of irony, one can conclude that irony originated from the earliest times and was of great importance both psychological and literary. Using irony, writers tortured in their texts to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the government or simply to paint more brightly and colorfully the perspectives or situation. All researchers correctly point out that ironically the word used is necessarily

implemented in the context and that it is the context that makes it possible to recognize and decode the irony that is realized within the sentence of the paragraph of the whole text.

Theoretical and methodological basis

Today, many specialists agree that information that is used by a person when interpreting text is not limited to knowing only the language. In order to understand the ironic text, one must know a lot about the world as a whole. The international accounting of knowledge has been regarded as the most important principle of the new linguistic paradigm (Bahtin 1995:15,17) At the same time, in addition to linguistic information, in order to correctly understand the text or the discourse, the initial impulse of this understanding is given by the surface language form and is considered as the starting structure in this complex process. The problem of irony can legitimately be defined as one of the central focuses of contemporary humanitarian sciences, which is connected with the significant semantic potential that the concepts of irony and ironic acquire in the socio-cultural space of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Many-sided and diverse works on the problem of irony not only testify to the existence of existing approaches in the field of studying the phenomenon of irony in various branches of the humanities but also about the complexity of the multifaceted subject matter of requiring new interdisciplinary approaches and methods of study that would combine the existing knowledge and consider the notion of irony from a new angle view (Ahmanova 1969:10-108). The researchers distinguish such basic sources of the expression of irony as: 1) Oral interpersonal communication which includes par-linguistic cues transfer of irony of gesture or kinesic (mimicry of pantomime gesture) intonation (stress of pause timbre of melodic speech). As the sound speech develops and improves, the para-linguistic resources of interpersonal communication fade into the background as the spokesmen of rational information. They are practically completely excluded from the official speech but still widely used in colloquial speech. They are used to express emotional values of attitudes and relationships, and this happens involuntarily. 2) In oral and interpersonal communication often find application and linguistic in a greater degree of stylistics. They relate the epithets of archaisms and neologisms to the mixing of styles. 3) To express the irony, morphological and grammatical resources are also used. So, for example, irony can be expressed through the use of emotionally ef-

fective phrases having diminishingly negative connotations (Galle 1898:27-76). Among the few attempts to categorize the types of the ironic attitude, the interest of the classification of the English scientist R. Brown is very interesting. He proposed to distinguish. a) rhetorical irony b) irony of behavior c) irony of events d) dramatic or dialectical irony (Bolshaya Sovetskaya enciklopediya: 41). This classification is based on a sociological approach and practically does not take into account the differences in the types of irony used in other spheres. It is necessary with respect to a single integrative approach to the problem of irony to a large extent be exacerbated by the «terminological chaos» in the definition of the notion of irony that D.K. Mucke drew attention to several years ago «Compass irony» (Bolshaya Sovetskaya enciklopediya: 45). The circle of problems delineated in this research is still relevant for contemporary philology. The absence of a clear conception of irony, the researcher associates with the undeveloped criterion for determining the notion of irony. The researcher identifies a number of types of irony in the basis of which there are different criteria based on such inconsistently heterogeneous concepts as the effect of the function of the object and the subject of the irony of tone and attitude. This series is tragic irony, comic irony, irony of behavior, irony of the situation, philosophical irony, practical irony, dramatic irony, verbal irony, ingenuity irony, double irony, rhetorical irony, self-irony Socratic irony, cosmic irony, sentimental irony, irony of Fate, irony of chance, irony of character (Losev 1966:45). The classification of forms of irony, according to the concept of D.K. Mukke is based on the author's category. In the case of impersonal irony, the personality of the author is not expressed. Self-evident irony (self disparaging irony) the author pretends not to understand what is happening. Irony (ingenuity irony) the author puts his words in the way of the defense that sees and understands those contradictions that the intelligible cannot understand. Dramatized irony, the author describes an ironic situation or event (Bertrand 2009:45). About the creation of «an all-encompassing ironic formula,» B. O. Steits writes about the concepts of irony and dialectics. According to this concept, irony is linked to potential development and arises in the presence of «any possibilities in the natural course of things» or «the possibility of their appearance». In the work «The Irony and the Drama of the Poetics,» the scientist accentuates the idea that irony does not appear in the phenomenon as the object of the object but expresses itself in our relation to it and links itself to the sphere of the intellectual definition

of the world (Eastham 2011:44-220). In the book of A. Isthm, the problems of irony as a linguistic phenomenon are described by the genesis of this concept; the classification of the types of irony of the media of its creation is called various possibilities for its realization in speech. The irony in modern discourses practices takes on new forms and performs various functions, which makes research in the field of this phenomenon extremely urgent (Brown 1977:42-142). In the classification of P. Simpson, there are 4 varieties of ironic communication: • irony «from the opposite» (oppositional irony) the irony which was described by P. Greis (Grice 1989: 46). In connection with the development of problems of the semantic-pragmatic component of presentation, which refers to what is implied in the presentation but not expressed and strictly does not follow from it. • Echoes of those who use what was said or who could say in principle. • Increased irony (conferred) when the ironic interpretation of text or expression «goes against» the author's original intention, often such text or expression is taken as an ironic when it took some time. • Ironic belief in a fictional text (ironic belief) The researcher believes that sometimes the address is consciously aware of a fictional situation as if it really exists. The irony lies in the fact that while people are aware of the fact that such a situation has never existed (Muecke 1969:43 -112). Thus, the problem of classifying the types of irony can be declared a variety of its forms and situations in which, in principle, the expression of an ironic intention is possible. And yet, in the presence of two types of irony, one can not doubt the verbal irony and the civic irony. They differ from each other in a semiotical character. The former is used as the source of the natural language, whereas the actual irony does not bind to any system of signs. Our knowledge about what events and phenomena (including linguistic ones) are combined and which – is not a common cognitive basis for these two types of irony. In modern linguistics, irony is regarded as a stylistic figure and as a communication phenomenon. The controversial duality and inaccuracy determined the consideration of irony in a conjugation with a metaphor which, in its inherent improbability, involves a hyperbola (deliberate exaggeration) in the lithotope (deliberate understatement) hypotazation (belief contrary to improbability) (Haberikova: 25-27). It is necessary to intro-

duce the term «ironic meaning» reflecting the specificity of all stages of the communication act. The indicated research subjects are united by the presentation of the language game as a form of linguo-creative thinking which assumes a creative approach to the ways of expressing self-awareness of person. At the same time, irony is seldom realized separately at a separate level of the language. Most commonly, either the parallel use of the means of expressing irony at different levels or the peculiar «matryoshka effect» is observed when different and different levels of the expression of irony are included in each other forming a complex combination of linguistic resources. The irony in such a case transforms into a textual phenomenon that creates a duality of text that allows the author to implement successfully the manipulative potential of a political discourse as a whole.

The conclusion

The irony is a diversified reception in its manifestation, and it is only individual for each author that the concepts such as «sokratova irony», «romantic irony», irony of Plato and others, which classify irony not according to the stylistics of its creation, but according to the author's understanding of the concept of irony and manner its use in the text. The complexity of the study of irony is that it admits different interpretations of the meaning. To successfully decode the author's intention, knowledge of a broad context is necessary as well as an analysis of verbal and non-verbal means of expressing irony. It should be emphasized that in the current work, irony is not viewed as simply a classic reception but as a complex and multifaceted discourse phenomenon reflecting the critical attitude of the author or the speaker (including a wide range of emotional shades) to a particular subject or phenomenon. Irony gradually turns from a rhetorical and later – a stylistic reception into the worldview of the world view and in a special way manifests the state of the soul does not take on faith the stereotypes of the community do not relate seriously to the universally accepted values and views. The diversity of the lexical semantic and syntactic means for the creation of irony only confirms its significance, which in turn makes further studies in this field necessary and especially relevant.

Литература

- 1 Азнаурова Э.С. Языковая номинация Виды наименований – М.: Наука, 1997. – 238 с.
- 2 Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М., 1969. – 607 с.
- 3 Багдасарян В.Х. Проблема имплицитного. – Ереван, 1993. – 250 с.
- 4 Бажалкина Н.С. Роль иронии в дискурсе // Вестник МГУ. Серия Лингвистика. – 2009. – № 3.
- 5 Бахтин М.М. Вопросы литературы и эстетики. – М.: Педагогика, 1995. – 504 с.
- 6 Большая Советская энциклопедия. http://encdiccomenc_sovetIronija20800
- 7 Бурхард Л. Культура Возрождения в Италии. – М.: Феникс, 1996. – 591с.
- 8 Галлэ А. Ирония. http://www.psyofficeru5enc_philosophy2391htm
- 9 Дземидок Б.О. Комическом. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – 224 с.
- 10 Казакова Т.А. Практические аспекты перевода. – СПб.: Союз, 2001. – 320 с.
- 11 Ломоносов М.В. Полное собрание сочинений. – М., 1972, Т. 7. – 997 с.
- 12 Лосев А.Ф. Ирония античная и романтическая. – М.: Наука, 1966. – 526 с.
- 13 Лосев А.Ф. Шестаков В.П. История эстетических категорий. – СПб.: Истоки, 1965. – 374 с.
- 14 Мельников Г.П. О типах дуализма языкового знака Филол.науки 1971 № 5(65) с 5469
- 15 Никитина С.Е., Васильева Н.В. Толковый словарь. – М.: АН России, 1996. – 172 с.
- 16 Ожегов С.И., Шведова Н.Ю. Толковый словарь русского языка. – М., 2000. – 403 с.
- 17 Пивоев В.М. Ирония как феномен культуры. – Петрозаводск ПГУ, 2000. – 106 с.
- 18 Попова З.Д. Знаковая ситуация в лингвистике // Вестник ВГУ, № 2 2005– с 208216
- 19 Ушаков Д.Н. Толковый словарь. – М.: АльтаПринт, 2005. – 1216 с.
- 20 Соссюр Ф. Курс общей лингвистики. – М.: Прогресс, 1999. – 278 с.
- 21 Хабекирова З.С. Стратегия дискредитации и приемы ее реализации в дискурсе демократической оппозиции, 2005
- 22 Шатуновский И.Б. Ирония и ее виды Языковые механизмы комизма. – М., 2007. – 372 с.
- 23 Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика дискурса Диссертация. – Волгоград, 2000. – 440 с.
- 24 Bertrand D. Dézé A.J. Missika «Le «carré sémiotique» des discours politiques» Mensuel № 209 – novembre 2009. – 114 p.
- 25 Brown R.H. A poetic for sociology Toward a logic of discovery for the human sciences Cambridge 1977. – 365 p.
- 26 Eastham A. Aesthetic Afterlives Irony Literary Modernity and the Ends of Beauty London 2011. – 273 p.
- 27 Simpson P. On the Discourse of Satire Towards a Stylistic Model of Satirical Humour P Simpson – Amsterdam Philadiephia John Benjamins 2003. – 236 p.
- 28 States B.O. Irony and Drama. – New York, 1971. – 312 p.
- 29 Muecke D.C. The Compass of Irony – London, 1969. – 203 p.
- 30 Grice H.P. Studies in the Way of Words HP Grice – Cambridge: MA Harvard University Press, 1989. – 394 p.

References

- 1 Aзнаурова Je.S. Jazykovaja nominacija Vidy naimenovanij – M.: Nauka, 1997. – 238 s.
- 2 Ahmanova O.S. Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov. – M., 1969. – 607 s.
- 3 Bagdasarjan V.H. Problema implicitnogo. – Erevan, 1993. – 250 s.
- 4 Bazhalkina N.S. Rol' ironii v diskurse // Vestnik MGU. Serija Lingvistika. – 2009. – № 3.
- 5 Bahtin M.M. Voprosy literatury i jestetiki. – M.: Pedagogika, 1995. – 504 s.
- 6 Bol'shaja Sovetskaja jenciklopedija. http://encdiccomenc_sovetIronija20800
- 7 Buruhard L. Kul'tura Vozrozhdenija v Italii. – M.: Feniks, 1996. – 591s.
- 8 Gallje A. Ironija. http://www.psyofficeru5enc_philosophy2391htm
- 9 Dzemidok B.O. Komicheskomo. – M.: Progress, 1974. – 224 s.
- 10 Kazakova T.A. Prakticheskie aspekty perevoda. – SPb.: Sojuz, 2001. – 320 s.
- 11 Lomonosov M.V. Polnoe sobranie sochinenij. – M., 1972, T. 7. – 997 s.
- 12 Losev A.F. Ironija antichnaja i romanticheskaja. – M.: Nauka, 1966. – 526 s.
- 13 Losev A.F. Shestakov V.P. Istorija jesteticheskikh kategorij. – SPb.: Istoki, 1965. – 374 s.
- 14 Mel'nikov G.P. O tipah dualizma jazykovogo znaka Filol.nauki 1971 № 5(65) s 5469
- 15 Nikitina S.E., Vasil'eva N.V. Tolkovyy slovar'. – M.: AN Rossii, 1996. – 172 s.
- 16 Ozhegov S.I. i Shvedova N.Ju. Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo jazyka. – M., 2000. – 403 s.
- 17 Pivoev V.M. Ironija kak fenomen kul'tury. – Petrozavodsk PGU, 2000. – 106 s.
- 18 Popova Z.D. Znakovaja situacija v lingvistike // Vestnik VGU, № 2 2005– s 208216
- 19 Ushakov D.N. Tolkovyy slovar'. – M.: Al'taPrint, 2005. – 1216 s.
- 20 Sossjur F. Kurs obshhej lingvistiki. – M.: Progress, 1999. – 278 s.
- 21 Habekirova Z.S. Strategija diskreditacii i priemny ee realizacii v diskurse demokraticheskoj oppozicii, 2005
- 22 Shatunovskij I.B. Ironija i ee vidy Jazykovye mehanizmy komizma. – M., 2007. – 372 s.

- 23 Shejgal E.I. Semiotika diskursa Dissertacija. – Volgograd, 2000. – 440 s.
- 24 Bertrand D. Dézé A.J. Missika «Le «carré sémiotique» des discours politiques» Mensuel № 209 – novembre 2009. – 114 p.
- 25 Brown R.H. A poetic for sociology Toward a logic of discovery for the human sciences Cambridge 1977. – 365 r.
- 26 Eastham A. Aesthetic Afterlives Irony Literary Modernity and the Ends of Beauty London 2011. – 273 p.
- 27 Simpson P. On the Discourse of Satire Towards a Stylistic Model of Satirical Humour P Simpson – Amsterdam Philadiephia John Benjamins 2003. – 236 p.
- 28 States B.O. Irony and Drama: New York, 1971. – 312 r.
- 29 Muecke D.C. The Compass of Irony – London, 1969. – 203 r.
- 30 Grice H.P. Studies in the Way of Words HP Grice – Cambridge. – MA Harvard University Press, 1989. – 394 p.