IMPLICATURE IN THE STUDY OF PRAGMATICS

Abdukarimov Valixon[1]

[1] National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Foreign philology faculty 2nd year student.

Gmail: valixan.politics.gov@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4967871

ABSTRACT

The following article focuses on the new branch of linguistic Pragmatics. We studied the role of implicature in the study of pragmatics using different sources. We analyzed the two types of pragmatics and their differences.

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is a new branch of linguistic inquiry which was introduced in the 1930s by linguists Morris, Carnap and Pierce who described syntax as the formal relations of signs to each other, semantics as the relation of signs to what they mean and pragmatics as the relation of signs to their whom they are used and interpreted by (Morris 1938).

DISCUSSION

Firstly, we need to define the meaning of the term **implicature**. Describes implicature as a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. The central data for pragmatics are cases when the speaker conveys more than one meaning or different meaning from the word he uses. An implicature is what the speaker intends to mean, explaining simply the implicature is the usage of words and phrases in a wider meaning.

Once the difference between what the speaker says and what he means is made, it will be easier to give examples. One example that was given by Grice is fairly famous. A professor is asked for and recommendation letter for his student who is a candidate for a particular job, and he writes it in following words:

Dear Sir,

Mr. Jones's command of English is excellent, and his attendance at tutorials has been regular.

Yours etc.

In the given example, we can state that the professor implicates that he does not have a god opinion on that student's philosophical abilities because if he had had

something good to say, he should have done so. Although he uses positive adjectives, he does not have much to say about his philosophical knowledge and intelligence.

Usually what a speaker wants to say is far richer in meaning that what he directly says. If we look at the history of the difference of the said and meant, and derivatively between the said and the implicated (meant but not said), it dates back the fourth century which was the period of Servius and Donatus who characterized pragmatic understatement as a form of in which we say less that we mean (**minus dicimus et plus significamus).** According to Gricean model, the said is connected to the meant through implicature. Being an aspect of what the speaker means, implicature is different from the non-logical opinion the hearer draws.

TYPES OF IMPLICATURE

Grice defines two types of implicature: **conventional implicature** and **conversational implicature**. The differences between these types are explained by Lyons

The difference between them is that the former depend on something other than what is truth-conditional in the conventional use, or meaning, or particular forms and expressions, whereas the later derived from a set of more general principles which regulate the proper conduct of conversation.

Conventional implicature is associated with the general meaning and the usage of the word whilst conversational implicature refers to the general principles of the correct usage of substitutions.

CONCULUSION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Today, conversational implicature is regarded as the most essential and the most fundamental issue in the study of pragmatics. It turns out that implicature is needed in order to connect the communication and explain the language facts which are not included in the study and theories of the structural language. The easiest way to understand the implicature is to be involved into the conversation and share the same experience and knowledge

References:

1. Nicholas Allot – "Key Terms in Pragmatics" 2010
2. Latif Amrullah – "Implicature in the study of pragmatics"
3. Laurence R. Horn and George Ward – "The Handbook of Pragmatics"