

Mariusz CYBULSKI

**A Discussion of Roman Jakobson's Semiotic Theory
of Language Functions and its Alternative**

Semiotyczna teoria funkcji języka Romana Jakobsona i jej wersja alternatywna

Семиотическая теория функции языка Р. Якобсона и её альтернативная версия

Jakobson's theory of language functions is well-known not only to linguists but also to literary theoreticians; as a matter of fact, it may be found in most manuals of poetics. His views are also relevant to the general theory of meaning. Their application, then, is not restricted to linguistics or poetics; Jakobson's theory has a definitely semiotic character. In the present article we shall trace the origin of the theory, comment on its accuracy and try to suggest some improvements.

The factors which have contributed to Jakobson's theory are three in number: Russian formalism, Karl Bühler's presentation of the language functions, and the theory of information.

The formalists, their radical wing in particular, attempted to develop new methods of linguistic analysis with particular reference to various functions of language, especially to its poetic function. Influenced by futurists they understood poetry as messages with palpable linguistic textures which draw the reader's attention owing to their additional phonic organization, or special composition. What is indicative of poetry, then, is purely linguistic manipulation and not value. The formalists also endeavoured to elaborate criteria for the delimitation of poetic and practical (ordinary) language. The two, they held, are in sharp opposition to each other because of different hierarchies of functions: practical language refers to the world around while poetry is, as it were, self-centred, the aesthetic function being dominant in it.

The two notions, i.e. that of a hierarchy of functions and that of the dominant function, have become parts of Jakobson's theory. Furthermore, the understanding of poetry as a special kind of language, and for that matter the conviction that problems of poetry cannot be separated from linguistics and problems of language as such, is also relevant to the theory under consideration.

It is noteworthy that in 1919 Jakobson wrote an essay on Velimir Chlebnikov's poetry, which was his first attempt at the analysis of language in its means and functions. The essay was printed in Prague towards the beginning of 1921.

Bühler's theory of functions originated in 1920, was expounded in *Sprachtheorie*¹ (1933) and fairly widely accepted by the linguists of the Prague Linguistic Circle, with Jakobson in their number, in the 1930's. Bühler's point of departure was Plato's organon model of language presented in *Kratylos*, according to which language is a tool (*organon*) by means of which someone tells someone else about things. In order to specify relationships between the constitutive elements of the model, i.e. the speaker, the utterance, the hearer as well as the things and the states of affairs referred to, Bühler analyzed the speech circuit in terms of stimulus and response. Subsequently he asserted that in every instance of speech the function of the utterance varies with each of the constitutive elements, and thus the setting up of the utterance with the things and the states of affairs referred to constitutes the communicative function (*Darstellungsfunktion*), that of the utterance with the speaker the expressive function (first called *Kundgabe-*, then *Ausdrucksfunktion*), and that of the utterance with the hearer the appeal function (first named *Auslösungs-*, later *Appelfunktion*).

Bühler's theory explains structural properties of utterances belonging to certain spheres of linguistic practice only: e.g., it accounts for differences among lyric (the expressive function), rhetoric (the appeal function), and epic (the communicative function). It is evident then that the theory is far from being satisfactory. In the present article, however, we shall not elaborate it in greater detail.²

Particularly important is Bühler's impact on Jakobson. Among the functions and the constitutive elements of a speech event which he distinguished, we find Bühler's three functions and three basic factors. The difference lies in terminology as well as other functions and constitutive elements added by Jakobson, but these will be dealt with later on.

¹ K. Bühler: *Sprachtheorie*, Stuttgart 1965.

² Cf. J. Lalewicz: *Krytyka teorii funkcji mowy Böhlera-Jakobsona*, „Teksty”, 1973, nr 6 (12).

What is of the utmost importance, however, is Bühler's understanding of a function as a relationship between the utterance and a constitutive element; Jakobson conceived of it in a similar way.

Last but not least, the theory of information has contributed to his presentation of language functions. The theory was formulated by R. W. Hartley in 1928 and developed by C. E. Shannon and W. Weaver in the late 1940's.³ Although primarily concerned with the discovery of mathematical laws governing systems communicating or manipulating information, it also provides interesting insights into interpersonal communication through speech.

Six constitutive factors of a speech event distinguished by Jakobson have their origin in the elements of a basic communication system investigated by information theoreticians. The ADDRESSER comprises the information source and the transmitter whereas the ADDRESSEE stands for both the receiver and the destination. The CONTACT roughly corresponds to the channel, and the MESSAGE to the signal. A CODE is common to both theories. One may question the apparent absence of the CONTEXT from the model of the basic communication system. It should, however, be remembered that meaning is irrelevant to the problem of transmitting information, although transmitted messages sometimes have meaning as they may relate to some context. As distinct from information theoreticians, Jakobson did not take into consideration noise (a noise source), i.e. the disturbing effects which may distort or change the signal in course of its transmission; redundancy in language is the protection against it.

Jakobson stresses that a speech event always entails an exchange, which means that there is no addresser without an addressee: even non-exteriorized or inner speech is underlain by dialogue. The basic linguistic notions, language and speech, find their counterparts in the code and the message respectively. He claims however that the uniformity of the code for all the members of a given community suggested by F. de Saussure in *Cours de linguistique générale* is a fiction as "everyone belongs simultaneously to several speech communities of different radius and capacity".⁴ But we can imagine a uniform code which allows us to choose subcodes suitable in given circumstances. This is what American sociolinguists have termed communicative competence, i.e. an ideal knowledge of the rules governing the use of language according to various social roles and situations; it enables the addresser to select proper subcodes.

³ C. E. Shannon, W. Weaver: *The Mathematical Theory of Information*, Urbana 1949.

⁴ R. Jakobson: *Retrospect [w:] Selected Writings*, vol. 2, Mouton, The Hague—Paris 1971, s. 719.

According to Jakobson, the set (*Einstellung*), or the orientation of the message by the addresser towards each of the six constitutive factors determines a different function of language. Since the factors are six in number, he distinguishes six functions: emotive, or expressive (the message is set to the addresser), conative (the message is set to the addressee), referential, denotative, or cognitive (the message is set to the context), metalingual, or glossing (the message is set to the code), and poetic, aesthetic, or self-assertive (the message is set to itself). They rarely act separately. Normally we find a hierarchy of functions in a particular message.

Two of the six functions, referential and conative in its purest form, have clear grammatical exponents as they are opposed to each other on the level of a sentence: declarative versus imperative.

The emotive function is usually accessory and accompanies most of our messages. The conative is hardly separable from the emotive; any poetry is first and foremost an outlet for the poet's feelings. This function, however, is different from the others: we can assume a conscious, intentional orientation of the message to the addressee, the context, the contact, the code, and the message itself, but there arises a question whether a message performing the emotive function is always consciously and intentionally oriented by the addresser towards himself. This is true of lyric, confessional writings, or sheer feigning. It often happens, though, that utterances betray our feelings despite the strongest intention to conceal them from others. In a like manner, verbal reactions of a man who sits on a thumb tack can hardly be regarded as messages set towards the addresser. Jakobson, however, views the emotive function in terms of an intentional purpose only; he does not distinguish the two aspects of the function.

He claims that the dominant function accounts for the verbal structure of a message. But an orientation towards the contact does not involve any grammatical exponents, though it may be revealed in the subject matter, the linguistic context of the message or in the circumstances under which the message is produced, all being neglected in Jakobson's theory. So, by and large, there is no clear criterion, no grammatical characteristic of the text, which would allow us to specify, whether or not a particular message performs the phatic function.

Does the sentence "We are having nice weather this summer" perform the referential or the phatic function? Does the vocative perform the conative function? Jakobson answers the last question in the affirmative, for, according to him, the conative function finds its purest expression in the imperative and the vocative which serves to attract the addressee's

attention.⁵ But this is also an indication of the phatic function; the messages which perform it may be used, among others, "to attract the attention of the interlocutor".⁶ Which function does the vocative reveal then? Conative or phatic? We cannot decide this and similar questions without considering the circumstances of encoding or the linguistic context.

Any message, even a bare interjection, may serve "to establish, to prolong, or to discontinue communication, to check whether the channel works".⁷ All produced messages must necessarily be set towards the contact; otherwise encoding would be a fruitless task for if the significance of the contact were neglected there would hardly be any decoding and, consequently, any communication at all.

We would object to Jakobson's assertion that the phatic function is the first to be acquired by infants. "They are prone", he says, "to communicate before being able to send or receive informative communication".⁸ It seems to be evident that owing to children's self-centredness, the emotive and the conative function appear even before the phatic one.

Another thing worth mentioning concerns animal language. Jakobson claims that the phatic function is the only function animals share with human beings.⁹ The clucking of a hen, however, calling her chickens to come to eat grain indicates the emotive and the conative function as well.

While the phatic function seems to be omnipresent and not restricted to any particular group of messages, the role of the metalingual function is extremely limited. In casual language it may only be discerned in individual sentences. Examples of child language: "[...] Daddy — Daddy got — Look at Daddy... — Look at Daddy here... — Look at donkey — That's the boy — That's the donkey [...]"¹⁰ (1962) can hardly be regarded as messages speaking of the code. Anthony does not build equations. Instead he adds new constituents, changes forms, etc.; to put it succinctly he plays with language, and accordingly the term "metalingual" seems to be a misnomer here. This is a kind of entertaining function.

Jakobson asserts that "metalanguage [...] makes a sequential use of equivalent units when combining synonymic expression into an equational

⁵ R. Jakobson: *Linguistics and Poetics* [w:] T. A. Sebeok (ed.): *Style in Language*, The Technology Press of M. I. T. and J. Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, London 1960, s. 355.

⁶ *Ibid.*, s. 355.

⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, s. 356.

⁹ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁰ R. Jakobson: *Anthony's Contribution to Linguistic Theory* [w:] *Selected Writings*, vol. 2, Mouton, The Hague—Paris 1971, s. 288.

sentence: $A=A$ ".¹¹ So, to a question, *What is thyme?*, we can reply, *Thyme is thyme* ($A=A$). But does it convey any information about the lexical code of English? Certainly not. *Thyme is a kind of plant with fragrant aromatic leaves, growing wild and in gardens, used in cookery.* Not $A=A$, but $A=B$. In view of the above quotation, it is difficult to agree with the assertion according to which an orientation towards the code does not involve any grammatical exponents in the structure of messages. Aren't equational sentences, $A=B$, sufficient exponents?

If we take a look at the poetic function, we may conclude that an orientation towards the message does not imply speaking about this message as is the case with a set towards other constitutive factors. This is not, however, true. The metalingual function certainly entails speaking about the code or its components; the referential one about the world around. But a message performing the conative function is directed to, said to, the addressee. It says nothing about him, though; otherwise it would perform the referential or the emotive function. Indeed what we utter about the decoder or the context may be emotionally charged. Thus the emotive function does not mean speaking about the encoder only. Formulas like *Good morning* or dialogues for their own sake perform the phatic function. Do they speak about the contact then? Certainly not.

We may also conclude that it is the additional organization of a message and not the message itself that attracts our attention and becomes the source of the poetic function. This would mean that the poetic function is a function of the extra organization rather than the text as such, and it is distinguished on the basis of a different criterion. Is this so in actuality? We cannot forget that the additional organization is the result of an orientation of the message towards itself. Likewise a set to the context results, for instance, in an abundance of declarative sentences or neutral word order. The criterion for distinguishing the poetic function remains the same: the message is oriented towards a constitutive factor.

Serious objections may arise as regards the empirical linguistic criterion of the poetic function. We shall consider this problem now. To encode any message, the addresser selects suitable lexical items. This selection is "produced on the base of [...] similarity and dissimilarity, synonymy and antonymy". So "if *child* is the topic of the message, the speaker selects one among the extant, more or less similar, nouns like *child*, *kid*, *youngster*, *tot*, all of them equivalent in a certain respect".¹² Subsequently the selected lexical items are combined according to the rules of contiguity (the grammatical rules of a particular language).

¹¹ Jakobson: *Linguistics...*, s. 358.

¹² *Ibid.*, s. 358.

The poetic function "projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination"¹³, and this is its empirical criterion. The term "equivalence" used by Jakobson without any further specification is rather ambiguous for it may refer either to meaning or to sounds. But in view of the quotation concerning selection we are prone to conclude that equivalence in meaning is involved here. Thus, according to the above criterion, in poetry the principle of equivalence in meaning should be projected from the axis of selection into that of combination. The results of such operations, however, e.g. *Pugilists box*, are by no means poetic. It follows, then, that what is characteristic of poetry is phonic equivalence which, together with contiguity, operates on the axis of combination. It is not projected from the axis of selection for the simple reason that it does not operate there. To sum up, in the case of the poetic function a principle of phonic equivalence is superimposed on contiguity, this being the source of the extra organization. Nothing, however, is projected from the axis of selection.

Jakobson's assertion that "equivalence is promoted to the constitutive device of the sequence"¹⁴ is also objectionable. In fact, contiguity is still the crucial factor, and any attempt to achieve phonic equivalence is necessarily determined by the rules of contiguity. Thus the requirements of contiguity always take precedence over those of phonic equivalence; sacrificing sense for rhyme is usually criticized.

Jakobson gives no objective indications that would enable us to ascertain whether the poetic function dominates over other functions in a given message. In both modern advertizing jingles, versified mediaeval laws, and Sanskrit scientific treatises in verse, phonic equivalence is superimposed on contiguity. And yet he concludes that these texts do not assign to the poetic function "the coercing, determining role it carries in poetry".¹⁵ In them the function is only accessory. But what suggests such a conclusion, we do not know. Perhaps artistic values? Jakobson, however, seems to disregard them altogether and relies solely on the purely mechanical principle that consists in the superimposing of similarity over contiguity. It is hardly possible to distinguish a poetic kitsch from a masterpiece on the basis of this narrow criterion only.

The poetic function is characteristic of poetic language, but generally it does not apply to the language of narrative literature. He states that a "verseless composition" is a transitional area between the strictly poetic and the strictly referential.¹⁶ Actually, however, he identifies the language

¹³ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, s. 358.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, s. 359.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, s. 374.

of prose with that of every day, as the functions they perform are the same.

An answer to the question, "What time is it?", a letter, a novel, and a scientific treatise may all be assigned the referential function; in other words, they focus on the context. But is the context of a science fiction novel and of a casual message one and the same thing? The empirical world around us and the fictitious world in a novel may differ from each other diametrically, and this should find reflection in the theory of the functions of language.

According to Henryk Markiewicz, a literary text performs the referential, the emotive, and the conative function in a different way from a causal or a scientific utterance, viz. with the accompaniment of literary fiction, rich figurativeness and additional organization (in the case of poetry).¹⁷ In Richard Montague's and Saul Kripke's semantic frameworks, fiction can be conceived of as a talk about a possible world to which a message refers.

We have discussed each of the six functions distinguished by Jakobson. Now let us attempt an overview of his theory again. It should be emphasized that its aim was to serve as an introduction to the discussion of the poetic function. He endeavoured to find its place among the other functions in order to prove that poetry is a mere variety of language, and, consequently, "the linguist whose field is any kind of language may and must include poetry in his study".¹⁸ Jakobson's fault, however, seems to have consisted in that he took over from the theory of information an *a priori* pattern of constitutive elements determining respective functions; he imposed on linguistic reality what had originated in a theory not concerned with meaning. The result is that in many cases his functions do not fit into real texts. They are functions of abstract messages, or more accurately of the examples adduced by him in the article, *Linguistics and Poetics*.

It is only within the framework of the six constitutive factors that a function can be specified. Furthermore, a full or at least partial knowledge of the code is indispensable;¹⁹ if linguistic decoding is not there, we do not have a speech event, and consequently it is impossible to speak about language functions. Such a restriction is alien to Samuel I. Hayakawa's theory. Even if the language is incomprehensible, be it Hebrew or Church Slavonic, it is sounds accompanied by nonverbal affective

¹⁷ H. Markiewicz: *Granice literatury*, „Kultura i Społeczeństwo”, 1961, nr 2.

¹⁸ Jakobson: *Linguistics...*, s. 377.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, s. 353.

elements like incense that perform the ritualistic function.²⁰ Similar is the case of what he termed the hypnotic function.²¹

John L. Austin's approach (1962), too, was different from that of Jakobson. He scrutinized parts of language and on this basis derived functions which they exhibited.²² Thus his functions refer to real samples of language. Although they pertain only to part of spoken language, they are based on empirical facts whereas we cannot always say this about Jakobson's functions. Had Austin expanded his theory so as to cover the whole sphere of language, it would probably have been the most adequate presentation of functions that has been offered so far.

There presents itself another equally significant difference between both scholars. Jakobson spoke about a message which is based on expressions while Austin focused on an utterance. An expression in an abstract entity; it has meaning once and for all and does not refer to particular circumstances. On the other hand, an utterance depends on circumstances; its meaning changes according to them. Obviously then, Austin realized that the factual meaning is changeable whenever the situation changes. He treated functions as different uses people make of language in different speech events and often repeated that any speech act must be investigated in its total communicative situation. By and large, Austin was circumstantially oriented while Jakobson rather grammatically, though, it should be recalled, not all his functions have clear exponents in the structure of a message. His functions are static because the relations among the constitutive elements are static. Austin's emphasis on the circumstances is his greatest achievement which places his theory above that of Jakobson.

All things considered, it is impossible to place Jakobson's presentation of language functions in a broader context of current grammatical theories for two reasons:

1) there is no direct correspondence between the grammatical structure of a message and its function in all the six cases,

2) the circumstances in which a text is encoded are entirely disregarded.

Had they be taken into consideration, we could draw a parallel between them and the presupposition of generative semantics. Any com-

²⁰ S. I. Hayakawa: *Language in Action*, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York 1941, s. 75.

²¹ *Ibid.*, s. 188.

²² J. L. Austin: *How to Do Things with Words*, J. O. Urmson, M. Sbisà (eds), Clarendon Press, Oxford 1975.

parison with speech act theory shows only the incompleteness of Jakobson's presentation for as distinct from his, Austin's functions have two aspects:

- 1) intentional (illocutionary acts and partially perlocutionary),
- 2) pertaining to the production of real effect (happily performed perlocutionary acts).

And, of course, an illocutionary act is determined by the locutionary act, or the linguistic sense of utterance, and the circumstances of utterance.

In the subsequent part of the present article we shall suggest a few improvements that might result in a more comprehensive character of Jakobson's theory.

As has already been mentioned, Jakobson views the functions of language in terms of orientation. This conception differs from a purely relational one, e.g. that of Bühler, in that an *Einstellung* is a relation of the addresser to the relations between the message or, to be more precise, the process of encoding and the six constitutive factors of any speech events. It is a kind of metarelation or relation of the second degree, which involves three arguments:

Addresser-(Message-Addresser) — the emotive function,

Addresser-(Message-Addressee) — the conative function,

Addresser-(Message-Contact) — the phatic function, etc.

Such a conception, however, does not account for the emotive function understood as an effect rather than an intentional purpose. Nor does it specify whether or not messages like: "There is a terrible draught in here" perform the conative function in addition to the referential one.

A solution to the first problem seems to be feasible within the framework of the three arguments by simply changing the order of arguments constituting the basic relation. Thus, the relation (Message-Addresser) expresses the emotive function in terms of an intentional purpose whereas (Addresser-Message) in terms of an effect; the utterance betrays its encoder's feelings.

To solve the other problem, it is necessary to introduce a new component of speech events, viz. a social context, or consituation, in which a given message is uttered. Such a factor will undoubtedly be helpful in deciding whether or not an utterance about weather reveals the phatic function, to give yet another example.

Thus a speech event comprises seven constitutive factors, some of which may be further subdivided so as to account for variants within each function:

- 1) Addresser
- 2) Addressee
- 3) Contact: a) *thought*, b) *spoken*, c) *written*
- 4) Message
- 5) Code: *various linguistic and nonlinguistic subcodes here*
- 6) Context: a) *real world, divided into its aspects (topics), e.g. science, art, everyday life, etc.* b) *possible worlds*
- 7) Consituation: *various elements here, e.g. the interlocutors' social roles, time and setting, witnesses, and other circumstances.*

As distinct from Jakobson's conception, a function is now viewed in terms of a metarelation which includes four arguments: Addresser — (Message — X) — Consituation, where X stands for any of the constitutive factors. Functions conceived of as intentional purposes are seven in number: 1) emotive, 2) conative, 3) phatic, 4) poetic, 5) metalingual, 6) referential (real and possible), 7) situational.

In the case of the last function any use of the code is totally determined by the consituations in which messages are uttered; no individual modification is possible. This function dominates in ritualistic, petrified utterances utilized in magical, religious or other ceremonies. It also plays a secondary role in messages abounding in clichés.

Functions in terms of an effect may be schematized as Addresser — (X — Message) — Consituation. If X stands for the addresser, the formula specifies the unintentional emotive function.

Messages performing a given function may be further differentiated with respect to the contact, the aspects (topics) of worlds, and the style. The three factors assign the messages to different functional variants or registers which, in sociolinguistic terminology, are varieties distinguished according to use and defined by their formal properties. Registers differ with respect to:

- 1) mode of discourse, i.e. contact,
- 2) field of discourse, i.e. aspects (topics) discussed,
- 3) style of discourse.

The primary distinction on the dimension of the mode of discourse is that into *thought spoken* and *written* variants. The *spoken* variety usually involves short sentences, repetitions, hesitations, mistakes in performance, etc. It may be realized as a dialogue or monologue. The *written* variant, generally a monologue, is more "correct" and less spontaneous. It excludes paralinguistic means of expression, which are characteristic of the previous variety, and makes use of certain grammatical forms, e.g. *passé simple* in French, not to be found anywhere else. The *thought*

variant, i.e. inner speech, is closest to outer dialogues between people familiar with each other and the topic of their conversation. It abounds in ellipses, those of the noun phrase in particular.

The field of discourse refers to the area of verbal activity. On this dimension we can distinguish variants according to topics discussed.

Stylistic variants are specified by a metarelation comprising four arguments: [(Addresser-Addressee)-Consituation]-Code. Any classification of styles will always be more or less arbitrary. It is possible, however, to point out basic possibilities: *vulgar (slang)*, *intimate*, *informal (casual)*, *respectful* (usually used by one interlocutor in the verbal interaction), *consultative (neutral, matter — of — fact)*, *formal* (preferred in public, serious, ceremonial occasions), and *frozen (evasive, repellent)*.²³

It should be emphasized that thematic and stylistic variants are interdependent; certain topics are realized only in certain styles. Thus science may be discussed in the consultative or the formal style, less frequently in the respectful variant (when somebody's merits are praised and his faults disregarded) or even in the frozen one. But it is difficult to imagine a scientific discussion in the intimate style.

The sum up, functional variants are specified according to the following formula:

Contact	—	(Context — [(Addresser-Addressee)-Consituation]-Code)
<i>thought</i>	<i>diverse thematic</i>	<i>vulgar, intimate, informal,</i>
<i>spoken</i>	<i>variants</i>	<i>respectful, consultative, formal,</i>
<i>written</i>	<i>real or possible</i>	<i>frozen</i>

Now let us consider a few messages and see if the new differentiations make possible a more accurate functional classification of utterances:

1. "Mother, you know I don't have a robe. Wel, we're having a slumber party tomorrow night".

a) in Jakobson's theory it performs the referential function, the conative one being secondary (the vocative "Mother"): Addresser — (Message — Context);

b) in the seven-constitutive factor theory, the hierarchy of functions may be reversed owing to the consituation, which is taken into account here: Addresser — (Message — Addressee) — Consituation. The conative function (*a spoken, informal functional variant*) dominates when the message is glossed: buy me a robe. The referential function (*a spoken, everyday life, informal variant*) is secondary then.

2. "Oh dear, I wish I were taller!"

²³ Cf. Z. Bokszański, A. Piotrowski, M. Ziółkowski: *Socjologia języka*, Warszawa 1977, s. 90.

a) according to Jakobson: Addresser — (Message — Addressee), i.e. the message performs the emotive function;

b) consituation: said by a girl to her taller brother; she cannot reach down dishes from the top shelf: Addresser-(Message-Addressee)-Consituation, i.e. the conative function (*a spoken, informal functional variant*) is predominant; the utterance may be glossed: get down the dishes. The intentional emotive function plays a secondary role.

3. "It's raining cats and dogs again..."

a) according to Jakobson: Addresser-(Message-Context), i.e. the referential function dominates here. The emotive one seems to be secondary (the expressive phrase "cats and dogs");

b) consituation: used to begin a conversation. Addresser-(Message-Contact)-Consituation, i.e. predominant is the phatic function (*spoken, informal*); secondary are the situational function (revealed in the cliché) and the referential one (*spoken, about weather, informal*).

4. "Increasing the temperature (T) of a gas is, in effect, to increase the energy of each molecule of the gas [...] Therefore, the energy imparted by individual collisions, and by the total of the collisions, is increased".

a) in Jakobson's theory: Addresser-(Message-Context), i.e. the referential function;

b) Addresser-(Message-Context)-Consituation, i.e. the *real* referential function. The functional variant: Contact-(Context-[(Addresser-Addressee)-Consituation]-Code) *written, science, consultative*.

5. "When one is thus promoted to the moon, he receives the capacity to enjoy the drinking of soma-rasa, a celestial beverage [...] The atmosphere and amenities of life there are more comfortable and advantageous than those here on earth".

a) according to Jakobson: Addresser-(Message-Context), i.e. the referential function.

b) Addresser-(Message-Context)-Consituation, i.e. the *possible* referential function. The functional variant: Contact-(Context-[(Addresser-Addressee)-Consituation]-Code) *written, possible (space), consultative*.

It is evident from the above that the seven-factor theory solves a number of problems and provides a more detailed classification of messages according to their functions. As distinct from Jakobson's theory, it is also suited to deal with the language of the exact sciences as the code additionally comprises nonlinguistic subcodes, e.g. those of mathematical figures, chemical and physical symbols, etc.

STRESZCZENIE

Na ukształtowanie się teorii funkcji języka Romana Jakobsona wpływ miały trzy czynniki: formalizm rosyjski, poglądy Karla Bühlera i teoria informacji.

Według Jakobsona proces komunikowania się zakłada istnienie nadawcy, odbiorcy, kodu, komunikatu, kontaktu i kontekstu. W ramach tych sześciu elementów konstytutywnych określa się poszczególne funkcje języka, których istotą jest orientacja, czyli nastawienie, komunikatu przez nadawcę na którymkolwiek z wymienionych elementów.

Jakobson wyróżnia sześć funkcji języka: emotywną (nastawienie na nadawcę), konatywną (nastawienie na odbiorcę), metajęzykową (orientacja na kod), poetycką (na komunikat), fatyczną (na kontakt) i referencjalną (na kontekst). Pojmuje on funkcje jako metarelacje: Nadawca — (Komunikat — x), gdzie x oznacza którymkolwiek z sześciu elementów konstytutywnych, i traktuje je tylko w kategoriach zamierzonego celu, co nie sprzyja pełnej klasyfikacji komunikatów.

W podejściu alternatywnym autor artykułu wprowadza nowy element konstytutywny — konsytuację, czyli wszelkie okoliczności, w których zachodzi proces komunikacji; nastawienie komunikatu na konsytuację staje się wyznacznikiem funkcji sytuacyjnej. Rozpatruje ponadto funkcje w dwóch aspektach: zamierzonego celu, Nadawca — (Komunikat — x) — Konsytuacja, i rzeczywistego skutku, Nadawca — (x — Komunikat) — Konsytuacja, w wyniku czego liczba funkcji podnosi się do czternastu. W ramach każdej z nich wyróżnia jeszcze warianty funkcjonalne w zależności od kontaktu (pomyślany, mówiony, pisany), kontekstu (świat rzeczywisty, światy możliwe) i stylu.

РЕЗЮМЕ

На формирование теории функции языка Романа Jakobsona повлияли три фактора: русский формализм, взгляды Карла Бюлера и теория информатики.

По Jakobsonу процесс коммуникативной деятельности предполагает существование отправителя, адресата, кода, сообщения, контакта и контекста. Рамками этих шести элементов определяются отдельные функции языка, сущностью которых является воздействие отправителя на любой из названных элементов.

Jakobson выделяет шесть функций языка: эмотивную (выражение чувств и воли говорящего), конативную (направленность на адресата), метаязыковую (направленность на код), поэтическую (организация сообщения), фатическую (направленность на контакт), референтную (на контекст). Он понимает функцию как метареляцию: отправитель — (сообщение — x), где x обозначает любой из шести элементов, и трактует её только в категориях намеченной цели, что не способствует полной классификации сообщений.

Автор статьи вводит новый элемент — конситуацию, т.е. все обстоятельства, в которых происходит процесс коммуникации; ориентация, направленность сообщения на конситуацию становится показателем ситуационной функции. Кроме того, рассматривает функцию в двух аспектах: задуманная цель, отправитель — (сообщение — x) — конституация, а также действительного эффекта, отправитель — (x — сообщение) — конситуация, в результате чего число функций возрастает до четырнадцати. Функциональные варианты выделяются в рамках каждой из них в зависимости от контакта (мысленный, речевой, письменный), контекста (реальный мир, возможные миры) и стиля.