

María Auxiliadora Barrios Rodríguez

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Spain

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6830-4797>

Lexical Functions and Pragmatic Functions: a Proposal for the Formalization of the Pragmatemes within the Meaning-Text Theory¹

Abstract. Pragmatemes have been defined within the Meaning Text-Theory as phrasemes pragmatically restricted, such as *for rent*, *drive slow(ly)*, *do not enter*, *beware of the dog*. This concept is close to the previous concepts of *pragmatic formulae*, *pragmatic markers*, *speech formula*, *linguistic cliché* and *gambits*, which cover expressions such as *I regret that*. We claim that *pragmatemes* are related to these concepts and also to a broad range of other expressions, such as: a) speech acts characterized by the influence of the extra-linguistic features in their meaning, as *¡soy humano!* (*only human!*), expression that does not mean that someone is human but that it is understandable he has made something wrong; and b) speech acts characterized by cultural aspects, as in the Spanish question *¿quién es el último?* (who is the last person?) in a queue (waiting in a commerce, for instance), due to the Spanish habit of forming messy groups instead of long queues. So far within the Meaning-Text Theory pragmatemes have been formalized by Lexical Functions, a formal tool useful for the categorization of the lexical relations. However, pragmatemes express not a lexical relationship between words but a pragmatic relationship by means of words between participants in a communicative situation. Consequently, they demand some extra-linguistic features. In this paper we summarize the different proposals regarding the concept of pragmateme, we define it, we claim that Lexical Functions are not adequate for them and we present what we call the Pragmatic Functions, a new tool inspired in Lexical Functions, useful for the formalization of pragmatemes, particularly in regard to Second Language Acquisition dictionaries and Natural Language Processing applications. Pragmatic Functions could also serve at the same time as a new taxonomy of illocutionary verbs.

Key words: *pragmateme*, *pragmatic formulae*, *lexicology*, *lexicography*, *Meaning-Text Theory*

¹ This paper has been founded by the grant FFI2017-83293 of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Economy for the project "Diretes: Diccionario Reticular Español. Diccionario analógico y relacional con acceso en red desde el sentido y desde la forma". I would like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful observations, to Deborah Paton for all her suggestions on the English revision of the manuscript and to Joanna Szeszunowicz for her outstanding help in editing. Any remaining errors are the sole responsibility of the author.

1. Introduction

Pragmatemes have been defined within the Meaning Text-Theory (MTT) as phrasemes pragmatically restricted; that means expressions such as *for rent*, *drive slow(ly)*, *do not enter*, *beware of the dog* (Mel'čuk: 2015a: 29). The author claims: "the situation that the speaker wants to describe phraseologically binds the phrase A + B (...), the situation prescribes what to say and may be how to say it". The scholar admits that there may also be a broad concept of pragmateme: "a formuleme is a pragmateme if it is pragmatically constrained" (Mel'čuk: 2015a: 29).

The concept of pragmateme is relatively new and there is neither sufficient research nor agreement among scholars. Kauffer (2017) reviews the concept and Fréchon, Frassi and Polguère (2012) propose a broad pragmateme concept to include lexemes and locutions with pragmatic value. Barrios (2017) also claims for a spread use of the concept of pragmateme to create materials for Spanish Second Language Learners.

She considers that *hazme un favor* (*do me a favor*) is a collocation, whilst an expression such as *haz el favor de* (*do me a favor and ...*) is a pragmateme. The first Spanish expression is similar to the English collocation *to do a favor*, whilst the second Spanish expression can easily be rude and usually demands a higher authority of the speaker and a feeling of anger (such as the mother demanding her son or daughter to make the bed, when this is a daily petition without any success). Both (authority and anger) can be labelled as extralinguistic features and should be considered when describing the meaning of this expression in any dictionary (Barrios, 2017). But, how could such subjective features be described in an objective and formal way? Plus, on the other hand, could these types of productive structures also have been considered pragmatemes? What does it mean "pragmatically constrained"?

There is no consensus on the concept of pragmateme within the MTT but nonetheless, as we will summarize in the next section, the concept has been growing in significance during the last few years, even though outside the MTT framework. García Page (2007) claims that this term corresponds to the previous term *pragmatic formulas*, and that they are characterized because they are semantically, syntactically and phonically autonomous. Some other aspects have been studied by several MTT outsider scholars, such as pragmatemes as a signal of processing relevance and cognitive coherence (Komlósi, 2009), and as a signal of different psychotype of the speakers (Gorbunova, 2017). They have even been analysed in one language of South Africa by Nikuze (2014), who proposed a type of lexicographic representation of pragmatemes for general Kinyarwanda dictionaries.

The concept of pragmateme is close to a specific type of *marker* defined by Fraser (1996). He claims that there is a non-propositional part of sentence meaning that can be analysed into what he called *pragmatic markers*: markers that “taken to be separate and distinct from the propositional content of the sentence, are the linguistically encoded clues which signal the speaker’s potential communicative intentions” (Fraser: 1996, 326). The author recognized four types of Pragmatic Markers: basic marker, which is an expression of belief (such as *I regret that*); commentary marker, which comments on the basic message (such as *frankly*); parallel marker, which adds something optional (such as *in God’s name*); and discourse marker, which signals the relationship between the basic message and the discourse (such as, *incidentally*). As may be seen, pragmatic markers are attached to the discourse structure while pragmatemes are attached to the extra-linguistic context.

Fraser’s proposal is not so far from the *pragmatic formulas* (Smichdt, 1993) and from one particular type of pragmatic formula, called *gambit* (Keller, 1979). A gambit is a “formulaic expression whose primary role is strategic rather than propositional in nature” (such as *the main point is, or may I interrupt for a moment?*); “it makes it easier for the hearer to process the discourse by providing them with opportunities for top-down processing”; if there is an inappropriate use, the speaker can be viewed as impolite (Dufon, 1993: 27–28). As in the preceding proposal, we claim that the concept of pragmateme does not equate necessarily with the concepts of pragmatic formulae and gambits.

Finally, this concept is close to the concept of *speech formula* or *linguistic cliché* (Cowie, 2011). Cowie claims that a speech formula is not a *routine formulae* (such as *how do you do?*) and recognises two types of speech formula: independent clause type (such as *you know what I mean*) and dependent clause type (such as *if anything*). He claims that some of them contains the pronoun *you*. Some other recent works reflect the interest in all these kinds of expressions for learners of any language, such as Alessandro and Zamora (2011) paper on pragmatic speech acts from the Italian-Spanish contrastive perspective.

In this paper we reflect on the concept of pragmateme and its formalization in order to be included in dictionaries useful for Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Second Language Acquisition (SLA). We claim that pragmatemes can be formally described, and we present a new concept, the Pragmatic Functions, a formal tool that could assist towards this goal.

The paper is organized in seven sections. After this introduction, in section 2 we focus on the state of the art regarding the concept of pragmateme and in section 3 we present the one we are working with. Section 4 de-

finishes the concept of Lexical Function and summarizes the problems that arise when formalizing pragmatemes with Lexical Functions, which has hitherto been the usual practice to formalize them within the Meaning-Text Theory. Section 5 presents our proposal to formalize pragmatemes, the concept of Pragmatic Function, and section 6 shows a preliminary typology of pragmatemes by this formalization. Finally section 7 presents the conclusions.

2. The concept of pragmateme within the Meaning-Text Theory

The concept of pragmateme was defined for the first time within the Meaning Text-Theory as a set phrase composed of two lexemes A and B, such that it signified 'A + B' is not unrestrictedly constructed on the basis of the given Conceptual Representation out of the senses 'A' and 'B' (Mel'čuk, 1995: 179–189); the so called "conceptual representation" is a cognitive level attached to the extra-linguistic situation. In later works, the author claims that the pragmatemes are classified as a subclass of clichés (Mel'čuk, 2015b: 55)². The main point of his work is precisely related to the conceptual structure: whilst an idiom such as *kick the bucket* is used following a non-standard semantic rule (because it does not mean 'kick the bucket'), a pragmateme (we could think, for instance, on *wet paint*), demands a non-standard conceptual rule (Mel'čuk, 2015a: 60): in the following lines, we will try to explain what a conceptual rule is although very few works were performed on them within the Meaning-Text Theory. We should add that most MTT scholars have been working on the concept of pragmateme as defined by Mel'čuk (1995), which means that they do not work on a broad pragmateme concept, as proposed by Fréchon, Frassi and Polguère (2012) and Barrios (2017).

Regarding idioms, there is a non-standard semantic rule that orders "to block its free manipulation by syntactic and morphological rules"; then, when a speaker uses an idiom and says that someone *kicked the bucket*, he means that someone died and that he "is flipped" because of that

² The Mel'čuk hierarchy of phrasemes is presented step by a step in one of his later works: "A phrase E of L is a lexical phraseme if and only if it is not free, that is, if and only if it is constrained (...) A lexical phraseme is a semantic-lexemic phraseme if and only if its meaning and its lexemic implementation are both constrained with respect to its referent- that is, to its conceptual representation (...) A semantic-lexemic phraseme is a cliché if and only if it is compositional (...) A cliché is a fomuleme if and only if it has a specific abstract referent (...) A fomuleme is a pragmateme if and only if it is pragmatically constrained" (Mel'čuk, 2015b: 59; 74; 65; 69; 74; and 83 respectively).

(Mel'čuk, 2015a: 60). For Mel'čuk, this non-standard semantic rule explains the relationship between the meaning the speaker wants to express and the phrase he uses. We should highlight that *kick the bucket*, as with many idioms, includes the attitude of the speaker. As it is outside our specific field of research here, in this paper we will omit the role of the speaker's attitude of the idioms but we study its presence on the pragmatemes.

Returning to the issue of pragmatemes, as said before, besides a non-standard semantic rule, a pragmateme demands a non-standard conceptual rule (Mel'čuk, 2015a: 60). As it is not so easy to understand what is meant by non-standard conceptual rule within the MTT, we will try to approximate to its meaning by an example: when a speaker wants to express, for instance, the idea of *being careful* because there is fresh paint on something (such as handrails, fences or doors), at the semantic level he must choose the meaning 'wet' and 'paint' in English (*wet paint*), or 'touch' (*do not touch*), but neither the meaning 'be careful' nor 'fresh'; actually the expression *fresh paint* is used more frequently to refer to an entire room or house which was recently painted³. Consequently, we could say that there is a non-standard selection of the meaning ('wet paint') and its expression (*wet paint*) from the concept ('I want to warn you because there is something freshly painted and you could get dirty'). The non-standard conceptual rule can change from one language to another: in fact, for the same concept, at the semantic level a Spanish speaker will choose 'recently' and 'paint' to express the same idea (*recién pintado*, lit. *recently painted*) or will even add 'be careful' (*¡Cuidado, recién pintado!*, lit. *Be careful, recently painted!*)

To sum up, the complexity of the extra-linguistic situation attached to a pragmateme implies so many features that there are several meanings that could potentially be chosen to express any idea. Each language selects some of these meanings; consequently, we could claim that the same situation could be attached to different conceptual rules in different languages. Actually, the *wet paint* example shows different selections of meanings and words for each language, more than a rule linking concepts and words (consider, in any case, that the explanation for *wet paint* is ours, trying to illustrate the Mel'čuk's proposal).

Conceptual rules are being deeply analyzed by the Moscow' School in their ETAP4 applications (<http://cl.iitp.ru/etap4>). However, as far as we know, pragmatemes are not yet the subject of their research. As we have no experience working on conceptual rules, we will not work on them

³ We have confirmed our views on this subject with Google images (last revised January 15, 2019).

in this paper. However, we consider that the conceptual rules are attached to the extra-linguistic situation, and we will focus on this last point.

Few scholars have worked with the concept of pragmatemes within the MTT. Among them Blanco (2013, 2014) recognizes that pragmatemes are frozen statements conditioned not only semantically (as collocations and idioms) but also pragmatically, by the situation of communication. Blanco's research focused on the lexicographic study of the pragmatemes. He characterizes the pragmatemes by its *lexical anchorage*, a model for the pragmateme lexicographic processing previously proposed by Mel'čuk (2008). For instance, the lexical anchorage for the pragmateme *no parking* is *vehicle* (Blanco, 2014: 16). As Mel'čuk, Blanco proposes that the pragmatemes should not be stored on a dictionary as lemmas (2010); that means that *no parking* should not be a lemma but an addition of the lemma *vehicle*. This is, on the other hand, the usual way to work with the idioms, not only in the MTT dictionaries but also in the outsiders MTT general Spanish dictionaries.

As a result, the lexicographic entry of a dictionary for Blanco should be counted on some basic fields: lemma and equivalents in other languages (*prohibido aparcar, no parking*), variants (*it is forbidden to park*), lexical anchorage (*vehicle*), speech act (*order*), semantic structure (X says that Y cannot park there), synonyms and antonyms, and some other feature such as Lexical Functions (on the section 4 we present this concept) (2013, 2014).

Some other works have been published within the MTT. Most of them focus on small data and do not propose a new and clear definition of pragmateme (see, among others, Iriarte Sanroman (2000) for the Portuguese and Barrios (2007, 2008) for the routines); some other papers demand a revision of the concept (such as Barrios, 2017). Because of its relevance, we will comment on the content of a few more MTT proposals in the following section.

3. The broad concept of pragmateme

From our point of view, there are two MTT works that are particularly interesting for our subject: Mel'čuk (2015a) and Polguère (2016). The first one claims for the use of pragmateme in a narrow sense (as proposed by Mel'čuk, 1995). Both of them classify pragmatemes as a type of cliché, and clichés as a type of phraseological expressions. Polguère indicates that clichés (*have a nice day; sorry, I'm late*) are compositional but, on the other hand, they are idiomatic because "their content is prefabricated as much as its form" (2016: 13). He notes that they are always used as a speech act, but the speaker

does not build the speech act, he does actually mention it; in other words, the speaker uses the cliché as a quote (2016: 5). Polguère adds that there are several features attached to the concept of a cliché, such as variants related to the lexical and/or syntactic combinatory (*un instant / un petit instant; just a minute!, just a second!*); pragmatic features derived from the speaker, the listener and the medium (a medium could be a letter, an advertisement, etc.) and problems in their translation (2016: 5–6).

As shown in the above paragraph, Polguère studies clichés more than pragmatemes, and recognizes that any cliché is a Lexical Entity (2016: 5–6). Considering that Lexical Entity are mainly lexical units and *vocables* (Gader, Olliger et Polguère, 2014), we assume that it is a type of linguistic entity different from Lexical Units. Lexical Entity, as we understand it, is a higher category, and includes not only Lexical Units but also expressions, such as idioms, pragmatemes and so on.

In this regard, the traditional general dictionary's lemma is no longer necessarily a simple word or a compound noun. There is no problem of space, nor problem of alphabetic order in an e-dictionary. Moreover, we consider that *dictionary* denotes a smaller product than *e-dictionary*: we understand that the new e-dictionaries are big databases containing more than one type of dictionary (Barrios, 2019a; 2019b). This is the reason why we include the Lexical Entities as entries of our e-dictionary. In fact, we add each cliché and each pragmateme to our database as an individual entry of the dictionary, not as a part of some other lexical entry (such as Blanco proposes for the pragmatema *no parking*, which is a part of the lemma *vehicle*, see section 2). Furthermore, in our database we not only have two different entries (*no parking* and *vehicle*), but also an explicit relationship between both of them by means of the Pragmatic Functions, as we will see in the section 5.

We are working with a broad concept of pragmateme, which means that some of the examples of clichés from Polguère (2016) are labelled as pragmatemes in our database. We recognize that the concept of pragmateme, as well as the concept of cliché and formuleme, should be analysed for several scholars in order to get a consensus within the MTT approach, at least from the terminological perspective.

As this task exceeds the possibility of our individual paper, presently we will settle for partially adopting the typology proposed by Mel'čuk (2015a). He recognizes nick-names (*Eternal City*) and termemes (*State Department*) as a type of cliché. We claim that both can have a function as referential expressions, which means that they are used when we want to talk about an entity of the real world. Quite different are the other two types of Mel'čuk's clichés, never used to point at any entity but to evaluate something or to cre-

ate a social frame for the interaction between speakers: sentencemes (*better late than never*) and formulemes (*what time is it?*) He distinguishes the pragmatemes as a subtype of formuleme, characterized by being pragmatically constrained (*I'll pass the phone to...*) (Mel'čuk, 2015a: 83).

Comparing the last two examples (formulemes and pragmatemes), we could consider that only the second one requires a concrete extralinguistic situation: in this case, answering a phone call. This is apparently the essential feature for the distinction between formulemes and pragmatemes proposed by Mel'čuk (2015a). However, we would like to underline that, from his explanations, the limits between both of them still remains unclear. In fact, it is necessary to have a concrete extra-linguistic situation for most of the formulemes he proposes. For instance, the expression *what time is it?*, an example of formuleme, demands a situation in which there is one person without any clock, mobile, tablet, pc or any kind of device showing the time, and at least a second person with some of these devices.

Furthermore, as in English, there are two Spanish expressions related to this question, the first one is literally *what time is it?* (*¿qué hora es?*), but the second one is slightly different, *¿tiene hora?* (*do you have the time?*) There is a condition for the speaker to formulate both questions (he should not have any artefact to know the time) but there is only an extra condition for the first one: the listener should have an artefact and the speaker should know he has it before asking him; if not, the speaker should ask about the time by means of the second question. Then, the extra-linguistic situation imposes the selection of the adequate expression: it is quite impolite in Spanish to ask someone in the street *what time is it?* (we prefer *do you have the time?*) Consequently, the attitude of the speaker is also present: if he asks *what time is it?* to a stranger on the street, he will show a rude attitude and may provoke a not so positive answer. However, in daily life, as the second condition is fulfilled when we are with the family, colleagues or friends, we ask just simply *what time is it?*

In summary, the limits between formulemes and pragmatemes are not clear: Mel'čuk proposed that formulemes are clichés with abstract referents, and pragmatemes are formulemes restricted by extra-linguistic situation (2015b). From our point of view formulemes and pragmatemes share most of the features, but for the pragmatemes the extralinguistic situation is more specific and the dependency of the extralinguistic situation is stronger.

We define pragmateme as following:

A **pragmateme** is an **expression** (word, multiword, set of words or sentence) which has the following properties: a) it is **fixed** but it could have **variants** from the syntactic and lexicological point of view; b) it func-

tions as a **speech act**; c) it can be attached to a **pragmatic function** (such as to thank, to order, to greet, to congratulate, to evaluate, etc.); d) it involves the potential speaker and listener through **grammatical features** (such as person or time morphemes, deictics, and so on); e) it can be expressed by means of **oral or written text**; f) it could be attached to some particular **extra-linguistic situations** (such as an interaction in a restaurant, in the doctor's room, or an advertisement in a poster, direction for use, recipe or handmade signboard among others); g) it could express an **attitude** of the speaker and consequently may provoke an attitude from the listener.

Some of these characteristics have been proposed by several scholars, particularly by Polguère (2016), as shown before. However, we don't claim that compositionality is one of them, because as we will see it can be unnecessary for the concept of pragmateme we are working with. On the other hand, we have added three new factors: the grammatical features, the pragmatic function and the attitude of the speaker and listener. We will explain these features at the same time we present some examples in section 6. However, prior to that we need to present the concept of Lexical Function and explain why we think it is not adequate for the pragmatemes.

4. Lexical Functions and the problems that arise when formalizing pragmatemes

A Lexical function (LF) is a function that associates a given lexical expression *L* (such as *sound*), which is called the argument or keyword, with a set of lexical expressions, which are called values (such as *loud*, *strong*, *heavy*, *deafening*): a LF expresses a specific meaning associated (for this example, 'intense') (Mel'čuk, 1996). Then, he calls this function *Magn*, a Lexical Function that means 'intense' and is associated with several collocations as (1) and (2) shows, and (3) details:

- (1) $\text{Magn}(\text{sound}) = \text{heavy, loud, strong, deafening}$
- (2) $\text{Magn}(\text{rain}) = \text{heavy, intense, torrential}$
- (3)
 - a. 'intense' (specific meaning associated with *Magn*)
 - b. *sound, rain* = arguments or keywords of both sets of collocations
 - c. *loud, strong, heavy, deafening, intense, heavy, torrential* = values of *Magn*

LFs are usually a productive sense; for instance, *Magn* is useful when formalizing hundreds of collocations expressing the meaning 'intense'. Values

(adjectives in these examples) change from one keyword (*sound*) to another (*rain*). As (3) shown, there are only few values shared by different keywords (in (1–2) examples there is only one, *heavy*).

As their name indicates, LFs express a relationship between words. That is the reason why it is quite complicated to formalize any pragmatic relationship by LFs: as pragmatemes involve extralinguistic features, the LFs are inadequate for them. There is one way, used so far, to solve this problem: the called non-standard Lexical Functions, a type of LF created *ad hoc* for some specific and not so productive lexical relationships (Polguère, 2007).

In (4) we show the non-standard LF proposed by Mel'čuk (2008) for the lemma *peindre*_{L1} (*to paint*); here, the non-standard LF are the paraphrases [*this object was*] *recently painted*, which simply points out the extra-linguistic situation:

(4) [Cet objet a été] peint récemment : Peinture fraîche [sur un signe, pour prévenir qu'on peut se tacher]

[This object was] recently painted: Fresh paint [on a sign, to avoid someone touching it]

As the example (4) proves, the complex set of extra-linguistic features is present by means of a set of words that, without any previous explicit structure or template, shows some characteristics of the circumstances (something was recently painted), the message (lit. *fresh paint*) and the medium for the message (on a sign).

From our point of view, it is hardly understandable that a Lexical Function (which is a general meaning) can be assimilated to a single and particular paraphrase explaining a concrete situation of life: there is no meaning in a situation but an interactive and complex set of linguistic and extra-linguistic features linking the speaker and the listener.

That is the reason why we do not use Lexical Functions for pragmatemes but a type of formalism that try to make explicit what we call the Pragmatic Function.

5. A new proposal: the concept of Pragmatic Function

We understand a Pragmatic Function (PF) as a function that expresses a speech act (such as to thank, to order, to greet, to congratulate, to evaluate, to warn, etc.) and associates a given extra-linguistic situation (such as an encounter or something freshly painted) which is called the argument, with a set of expressions (pragmatemes, formulemes) which are called values

(such as *how do you do, how are you going; wet paint, do not touch*); (5–6) shows the formalization of these examples:

- (5) To Greet (greeting encounter) = *how do you do?; how are you doing?*
 (6) To Warn (something freshly painted) = *wet paint; do not touch; fresh paint.*

A Pragmatic Function involves a set of complex features; consequently, most of the apparently equivalent pragmatemes are different from one another in some sense. There is a fine granularity that could be expressed adding new formalism to the proposals of (5–6), as (7–8) shown:

- (7) To Greet_formally (greeting encounter) = *how do you do?*
 To Greet_colloquially (greeting encounter) = *how are you going?*
 (8) To Warn (something freshly painted) = *wet paint; do not touch.*
 To Warn (a house/room freshly painted) = *fresh paint.*

As (7–8) proves, the granularity of the information can be spread either by means of the Pragmatic Function, adding some features, such as *formally* or *colloquially* as in (7); or by changing the argument (such as *something freshly painted*) for a more specific one, a sort of hyponym (such as *house/room freshly painted*) as in (8).

However, not all the extra-linguistic features that can be included in this situation could be expressed in this way. For instance, in section 1 we indicated that on the point of Fraser's proposal (1996) we were more interested in the expression of the speaker's potential communicative intentions, which corresponds to the feature 'attitude' in our definition of pragmateme (see section 4). As far as we know, there is no proposal for a frame for the description of all the features that are playing a role in the use of pragmatemes or formulemes. As in our e-dictionary the space is not an issue, we are solving this problem in our database by different fields on our table for formulemes.

Consider the expression *he did nothing*. It could be used as any other group of words in a compositional way, for instance in the sentence *this student should have finished his task but he did nothing*. In this case we only have to apply the grammatical rules in order to understand its meaning. However, if we think about the isolated expression *he did nothing!*, we probably discover it could be attached to different meanings depending on the extra-linguistic situation, as Table 1 shows.

As this set of situations shows, the extra-linguistic situation determines the meaning of this expression: it could be paraphrased as 'he really disappointed me, I had expected more from him', for the first situation; 'he is guilty' for second one; and 'he is innocent' for the last one.

Table 1. Possible different communicative intentions of a speaker when he says *he did nothing!*

Pragmatic Function	Extra-linguistic Situation	Typical Extra-linguistic Situation	Sentence/ Formuleme	Possible example
To vent (his/her frustration)	Conversation	A conversation with a friend about someone else	<i>He did nothing!</i>	Someone has a friend who could help him to solve a serious situation, but his friend did nothing
To accuse	Trial	Public prosecutor about the accused	<i>He did nothing!</i>	Someone is accused of neglect in a case of grave emergency
To defend	Trial	Lawyer about the accused	<i>He did nothing!</i>	Someone is falsely accused of committing a crime and the lawyer talk passionately to the jury about him

Source: own research.

We are interested in collecting any kind of expression that depends on the extra-linguistic situation, although it is not yet clear for us if it could be classified as a pragmateme, as a formulème or as a cliché. In section 6 we will show with more detail some features we analysed when building our preliminary typology of pragmatemes.

6. A preliminary typology of pragmatemes

In our data base, we use a table called “Formulemes” for all the expressions that are under the conditions delineated in section 3, which includes the pragmatemes. Table 2 shows some of our data (we write the English version of the Spanish expressions).

At the present time, we have collected more than eight hundred expressions corresponding to pragmatemes or formulèmes. On the one hand, we include in our corpus speech acts lightly characterized by the influence of the extra-linguistic features in their meaning, closer to the concept of formulèmes, as *¡soy humano!* (*only human!*), expression that does not mean that someone is human but that someone wants to apologise and that in this situation it is understandable that he has made something wrong. And, on the other hand, we also include speech acts with a stronger influence of the extra-linguistic situation, closer to the concept of pragmateme, some of them

Table 2. Some pragmatemes and formulemes of our database and their classification

Pragmatic Function	Extra-linguistic Situation	Typical Scenario	Pragmateme	Register
To greet	Greeting encounter		<i>How do you do?</i>	Formal
To greet	Leave-taking greeting		<i>Good bye!</i>	Formal
To greet	Greeting encounter		<i>How are you doing?</i>	Colloquial
To greet	Leave-taking greeting		<i>Bye, bye!</i>	Colloquial
To accept	After an order or indication		<i>All right!</i>	
To accept	After an invitation		<i>Nice!</i>	Colloquial
To warn	Something freshly painted	Handrails, fences, doors, etc. recently painted.	<i>Wet paint! Do not touch!</i>	
To order and to express disappoint	Someone made something wrong	Someone else angry and with authority gives him an order	<i>Do me a favour and...</i>	
To apologise for something	Someone made something wrong	Someone wants someone else to feel not so bad because of that	<i>Only human!</i>	
To ask an to get in line	Someone arrive to a queue	A queue in a mini market in Spain	<i>¿Quién es el ultimo? (Who is the last person?)</i>	

Source: own research.

characterized by cultural aspects, as the Spanish question *¿quién es el ultimo?* (who is the last person?), usual in a queue (waiting in a commerce, for instance), due to the Spanish habit of forming messy groups instead of long queues.

Our methodology was based on dictionaries, observation and introspection. We are building a preliminary typology of formulemes and pragmatemes at the same time that we are adding the data to our database. At this stage we have classified almost one hundred of them.

Lack of space does not allow us to show here some other fields of our table for formulemes (which includes pragmatemes), but we have some more columns: among others the lemma, which corresponds to the lexical anchorage (such as *greeting* for the four first files); the attitude (where we can add both, the speaker's attitude and the listener's attitude it could provoke); and the Second Language Acquisition level (the recommended level for any

student to learn this pragmateme). Not all the boxes have to be filled, just the boxes necessary for each expression.

The main point, as table 2 shows, is that the Pragmatic Functions are expressed in a natural language in the fifth column of our table, which means that the Pragmatic Functions proposed in (7) as *To Greet_formally*, is expressed here in a more simple way, *To greet + formally*; and similarly with the PF *To Greet_colloquially*, expressed as *To greet + colloquially* (see files one to four). From our point of view, the first formalism we proposed in 5–8 (which remains to the formalism of Lexical Functions) only makes sense if it is beneficial for a NLP application; if not, the second way (the one on the table) is easier for humans. In any case, it is just a formal question.

Some problems that we hope to solve in the next few months, still remain. The most relevant for us is related to the set of list of all the Pragmatic Functions we want to propose; we would like to see if our data is consistent with the Searle distinction: “we must carefully distinguish a taxonomy of illocutionary acts from one of illocutionary verbs” (1975: 368). Until now, all Pragmatic Functions are expressed by means of verbs that could be labelled as ‘illocutionary verbs’, but not all of them correspond to illocutionary acts.

7. Conclusions

The revision of the state of the art related to *pragmatic formulae*, *pragmatic markers*, *speech formula*, *linguistic cliché* and *gambits*, proves that all these concepts can be included by the concept of *formulème*, and some of them to the concept of *pragmateme* in its spread sense (Mel’čuk 2015a). However, there is no consensus on the concept of *pragmateme* proposed by Mel’čuk (1995) and, what is more important, the concept has not yet been applied to e-dictionaries accessible to anyone, which means that we cannot analyse big data related to *pragmatemes* in any existent dictionary. As we are working on a new Spanish e-dictionary, we are using our own data to arrive at some conclusions. There are different approaches to the concept of *pragmateme* within the Meaning-Text Theory, particularly by Blanco and Polguère proposals, but we understand for *pragmateme* something with some different features.

We have defended that non-standard Lexical Functions are not adequate to formalize the *pragmatemes*, even if so far it has been the normal way within the Meaning-Text Theory. Instead of that, we have proposed what we call a Pragmatic Function.

As an e-dictionary does not present problems of lack of space, we are collecting the pragmetemes and formulemes not only by Pragmatic Function but also reflecting some other words (lemmas) related to them, which corresponds to the lexical anchorage; and the Second Language Acquisition level demanded for its learning.

As we have not finished our project, we have not yet worked with the Pragmatic Function related to declarations, nor with pragmatemes such as *you're fired* or *I resign*. So we need to finish our task before submitting a definitive proposal for the taxonomy of pragmatemes and formulemes, and before proposing that our list of Pragmatic Functions could be definitively understood as a corpus of illocutionary verbs. We may say that we cannot know if our analysis of the complete set of data will confirm the conclusions we present here, not only in regard to the concept of pragmateme but also to the potential use of Pragmatic Functions as a set of Illocutionary Verbs. We hope to finish our project in one more year.

References

- Alessandro, Arianna; Zamora, Pablo. 2011. Un análisis lingüístico y traductológico de algunos enunciados pragmáticos en una perspectiva contrastiva español-italiano. In: Pamies, A.; Luque Nadal, L.; Pazos Bretana, J. M. (eds.) *Multilingual Phraseography: Second Language Learning and Translation Applications. Phraseologie und Paremiologie*. Band 28. Breten: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren. 139–146.
- Barrios Rodríguez, María Auxiliadora (2007): A tool for learning routines. In Christina Gitsaky (ed.). *Language and Languages. Global and local tensions*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle/United Kingdom. 90–113.
- Barrios Rodríguez, María Auxiliadora (2008): Propuesta de descomposición semántica de fórmulas rutinarias del español en el marco de la Teoría Sentido-Texto. In Mellado Blanco, C. (ed.) *Colocaciones y fraseología en los diccionarios*. Peter Lang Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften: Frankfurt. 211–231.
- Barrios Rodríguez, María Auxiliadora. 2017. Hacia un concepto amplio de pragmatema y sus aplicaciones en ELE: el caso de ¡qué + sust./adj.! In Almeida Cabrejas, B., Canales, A.B., García Sánchez, J.J. and Jiménez López, M.D. (eds.) *Investigaciones actuales en Lingüística (II). Semántica, Morfología y Lexicología*. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá. 19–35.
- Barrios Rodríguez, María Auxiliadora. 2019a. Del concepto de planta de un diccionario al de base de datos léxica: cambios asociados a la lexicografía digital. En Calvo Rigual, Cesáreo y Ferran Robles i Sabater (eds.) *La investigación en lexicografía hoy: diccionarios bilingües, lingüística y uso del diccionario. Anejos. Quaderns de filologia: estudis lingüístics*. Valencia: Universitat de Valencia, vol 2, 605–620.

- Barrios Rodríguez, María Auxiliadora. 2019b. ¿Aún queda alguien para quien no exista un diccionario? *Diretes*, un diccionario electrónico apto para máquinas. En Cazorla Vivas, C., García Aranda, M. Á., Nuño Álvarez, M. P. (eds): *Lo que hablan las palabras. Estudios de Lexicología y Lexicografía en honor de Manuel Alvar Ezquerro*. Lugo: Axac.
- Blanco, Xavier. 2013. Les pragmatèmes : définition, typologie et traitement lexicographique. *Verbum*. 4 : 17–25. doi: 10.15388/Verb.2013.4.4977.
- Blanco, Xavier. 2014. Microestructura lexicográfica para unidades frásticas: los pragmatemas. *Revista Káñina*. XXXVIII: 13–18.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (eds.) *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 21–42.
- Cowie, Anthony Paul. 2011. Speech formulae in English: problems of analysis and dictionary treatment. In: Geart van der Meer et Alice G.B. ter Meulen (eds.), *Making sense: from lexeme to discourse, in honor of Werner Abraham at the occasion of his retirement*. Groningen: University of Groningen, GAGL 44. 1–12.
- Dufon, Margaret A. 1993. The acquisition of gambits by classroom foreign language learners of Indonesian. In: Alves, Mark (ed.) *Papers from the Third Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*. Tempe: Arizona State University. 27–42. <http://www.dssg.uchicago.edu/8c7i/02-emmie-lind/9781881044123-papers-from-the-third-annual-meeting-of-the-sout.pdf>. Retrieved: 01.01.2019.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1996. Pragmatic Markers. *Pragmatics*, 6(1): 167–190.
- Fréchon, Frassi; Polguère, Alain. 2012. Les pragmatèmes ont-ils un charme indéfinissable ? In Pierluigi Ligas et Paolo Frassi (ed.) *Lexiques. Identites. Cultures*. QuiEdit. pp. 81–104.
- Gader, Nabil ; Ollinger, Sandrine; Polguère, Alain. 2014. One Lexicon, Two Structures: So What Gives? *Seventh Global Wordnet Conference (GWC2014)*, Jan 2014, Tartu, Estonia. 163–171. [ffhal-00937187](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00937187/document). <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00937187/document>. Retrieved: 01.01.2019.
- García Page, Mario. 2007. Los pragmatemas: algunas consideraciones. In: Cuartero Otal, J., Emsel, M. (eds.), *Festschrift für Gerd Wotjak zum 65. Geburtstag. Band 1: Vernetzungen Bedeutung in Wort, Satz und Text*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 161–173.
- Gorbunova, Darya Alexandrovna. 2017. Spontaneous oral speech from the psycholinguistic side: pragmatemes in the speech informants with different psychotype. *Communication Studies*. 4(14). 73–82.
- Iriarte Sanromán, Álvaro. 2000. *A unidade lexicográfica: palavras, colocações, frasesmas, pragmatemas*. Braga: Universidade do Minho. <https://repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/handle/1822/4573>. Retrieved: 01.01.2019.
- Kauffer, Maurice. 2017. De la notion de pragmatème en phraséologie. In : Cosimo De Giovanni (ed.) *Fraseologia e Paremiologia Passato, presente, futuro*. Milan: Francoangeli. 70–81.
- Keller, Eric. 1979. Gambits: Conversational Strategy Signals. *Journal of Pragmatics*- 3 (3–4): 219–238.

- Komlósi, László I. 2009. The choice of the Context Yielding the Joys of Cortex : Relevance and Pragmatic Enrichment for the Lexicon. *Topics in Linguistics. Interface Between Pragmatics and Other Linguistic Disciplines*, 3. Bratislava : Universita Konstantína Filozofa v Nitr. 39–47.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1995. Phrasemes in language and phraseology in linguistics. In: Everaert, Martin *et al.* (eds.). *Idioms: structural and psychological perspectives*. Nueva Jersey: Erlbaum Associates. 167–232.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1996. Lexical functions and lexical inheritance for emotion lexemes in German. In Wanner, L. (ed.), *Lexical functions in lexicography and natural language processing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamin. 209–278.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 2008. Phraséologie dans la langue et dans le dictionnaire. *Repères & Applications*, VI. Barcelona: Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. 187–200.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 2015a. Clichés, and Understudied Subclass of Phrasemes. *Yearbook of Phraseology*. 6(1): 55–86.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 2015b. *Semantics. From meaning to text III*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Nikuze, Emmanuel. 2014. *Towards a theoretically motivated model for the lexicographic representation of Kinyarwanda phrasemes in general Kinyarwanda dictionaries*. Stellenbosh: Stellenbosh University.
- Polguère, Alain. 2007. Lexical function standardness., In: Wanner L. (ed.) *Selected Topics in Meaning Text Theory, In Honour of Igor Mel'čuk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 43–92.
- Polguère, Alain. 2016. Il y a un traître par minou : le statut lexical des clichés linguistiques, Corela [En ligne], HS-19 / 2016, mis en ligne le 08 juin 2016, consulté le 01 sept.-2019. URL: <http://corela.revues.org/4486>; DOI: 10.4000/corela.4486.
- Smichdt, Richard. 1993. Consciousness, Learning and Interlanguage Pragmatics. In: Kasper, Gabriele and

Lexical Functions and Pragmatic Functions: a proposal for the formalization of the pragmatemes within the Meaning-Text Theory

Resumen

En este artículo presentamos las conclusiones a las que hemos podido llegar tras analizar más de cien pragmatemas de los ochocientos que hemos recogido en nuestro diccionario. Hemos revisado el concepto de pragmatema, nacido en el marco de la Teoría Sentido-Texto (TST), y hemos visto que incluye, aunque es más extenso, conceptos previos como los de *pragmatic formulae*, *pragmatic markers*, *speech formula*, *linguistic cliché* y *gambits*.

Tras un repaso a los conceptos de pragmatema con los que se ha trabajado en la TST, hemos propuesto qué entendemos nosotros por pragmatema: un acto de habla asociado a una situación extra-lingüística particular, que está fosilizado de algún

modo aunque presente variantes, que se vincula a rasgos gramaticales (como los morfemas de persona o tiempo, o los déicticos), que se puede expresar oralmente o por escrito, que expresa una actitud en el hablante y puede provocar una actitud en el oyente.

Hasta el momento, en la TST se ha utilizado una herramienta llamada Función Léxica no Estándar para expresar de un modo formal el significado de los pragmatemas. A nuestro juicio es un error: una función léxica, como su propio nombre indica es léxica; para poder poner en relación una expresión con la situación extralingüística que le corresponda se necesita un recurso que no solo relaciones significados con unidades léxicas.

Hemos propuesto la existencia de lo que llamamos Función Pragmática (FP): una función que pone en relación un pragmatema con la situación adecuada de uso. Dado que un diccionario electrónico no tiene problemas de espacio, la FP permite recoger pequeños datos extralingüísticos, la actitud del hablante u oyente, el grado de formalidad del acto comunicativo, una entrada del diccionario a la que se pudiera asociar, etc. Hasta el momento las FPs que hemos formulado han podido ser expresadas como verbos ilocutivos.