

SOME FEATURES OF IMPLICATURE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERARY TEXTS

Akram Shermatov

Associate professor, head of the department of English theory and practice Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

This article describes explores the use of implicature in English and Uzbek literary texts within the framework of pragmatics. The author emphasizes the significance of language as a tool associated with various levels of human activity, particularly in text classification. The complexity of text organization, comprising multiple levels, poses challenges for linguistic analysis, requiring further classification processes. The discussion explores how implicatures contribute to the broader understanding of communication beyond the explicit meaning of words, emphasizing the dynamic and changeable nature of implicature in the text. Examples from English and Uzbek literary texts illustrate the application of conversational implicature, highlighting how speakers convey meanings beyond literal statements, requiring readers to infer implied meanings based on context and unspoken assumptions. The analysis of these examples underscores the importance of context in implicature interpretation.

Key words: implicature, language, text, pragmatics, literary, linguistic forms, implication, meaning, cooperation, entailment, conversational, conventional, communication, information, speaker, addressee, process, assumption, context

INTRODUCTION

The effort to study the text assumes that language can be interpreted as the most important phenomenon from the point of view of modern linguistics, as a whole language tool associated with different levels of human activity carried out in text classification. The text is one of the most difficult research objects. Given the complexity of text organization and the fact that it consists of a multi-level system, it is difficult to identify certain units and adapt them to the science of linguistics, forming them on the basis of further classification processes. There are many definitions of text proposed by different researchers. This refers to the written process of the text, which is structured according to certain laws, consisting of language units, that is, words, sentences, small texts, large texts, etc.

METHODS

The closest definition to our understanding of the essence of the text was noted by I.R.Galperin: "A text is a work of speech-creative process with a completed process, objectified in the form of a written document, literary processed in accordance with the type of this document, consisting of a name (title) and a number. At the same time, the text consists of special units (phrase units) connected by various types of lexical, grammatical, logical, stylistic connections, having a certain purposeful and pragmatic relationship" [Galperin, 2004:8]. Pragmatics is a subject which studies the language use, the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. The pragmatics of a literary text is a set of author's intentions, expressed using various linguistic means in the author's and character's speech in order to influence the reader, and designed for an in-depth interpretation by the reader of these means [Dotmurzayeva, 2006:8].

One of the pragmatic terms an implicature also plays an important role in text meaning. The term implicature was introduced into the philosophy of language by Grice in his William James lectures in 1967. It is now quite widely employed, not only by philosophers, but also by linguists [Lyons, 1979: 592]. The following

definition to the term implicature was given and developed a linguist by H.P.Grice: “Suppose that A and B are talking about a mutual friend, C, who is now working in a bank. A asks B how C is getting on in his job, and B replies, *Oh quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn't been to prison yet.* At this point, A might well inquire what B was implying, what he was suggesting, or even what he meant by saying that C had not yet been to prison. The answer might be any one of such things as that C is the sort of person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation that C's colleagues are really very unpleasant and treacherous people, and so forth. It might, of course, be quite unnecessary for A to make such an inquiry of B, the answer to it being, in the context, clear in advance. I think it is clear that whatever B implied, suggested, meant, etc., in this example, is distinct from what B said, which was simply that C had not been to prison yet. I wish to introduce, as terms of art, the verb implicature and the related nouns implicature (cf. implying) and implicatum (what is implied)” [Grice, 1975:43-44.]. In above-mentioned example implicature involves the speaker conveying more than the explicit meaning of their words. If A were to inquire further, they might seek clarification on what B intended to convey beyond the literal statement. This distinction between what is said (the explicit content) and what is implicated (the additional suggested meaning) is central to Grice's theory of conversational implicature. Grice's notion of implicature is intended to cover at least some of the difference between the broader, everyday, notion of implication and the narrower, philosophical, notion of entailment. He is also concerned to show how implicatures co-operate with, and supplement, material implication in the everyday use of language: we will not go into this part of his programme. The notion of implicature rests upon a distinction between what is actually said and what is implied (but not entailed) in saying what is said [Lyons, 1979:592]

RESULTS

Grice distinguishes two kinds of implicature: conventional and conversational. The difference between them is not always clear-cut in particular cases. In principle, however, the difference seems to be that, whereas a conventional implicature depends upon something additional to what is truth-conditional in the normal (i.e. conventional) meaning of words, a conversational implicature derives from a set of more general conditions which determine the proper conduct of conversation. It is the so-called conversational implicatures with which we are concerned here; and henceforth the terms 'implicature' and 'implicate' will be used without qualification in this narrower sense. [Lyons, 1979:593].

Assuming that we now have some idea as to what implicatures are, a natural question is how to explain their generation. Implicatures clearly play an important part in communication, and equally clearly, there is a great deal of consensus as to what the implicatures of particular situated utterances are. There must therefore exist a principled mechanism (or mechanisms) which licenses a set of inferences, given an utterance and its setting [Cruse 2000:354].

Implicature is an element of meaning, content that is not permanent, changes rapidly in the text and may even disappear [Safarov, 2008:133]. In the process of speech communication, under the influence of the illocutionary goals of the speakers, one of the information in the proposition becomes actual. Irrelevant information moves to the level of implication according to the speech situation. Therefore, it is evident that there is a need to study the meaningful structure of units such as expression or text, speech, their actualization or non-actualization, open or closed structure, especially the process of semantic implication. It seems that issues related to the process of implication occupy the main place among the problems of pragmalinguistics [Hakimov, 2013:].

The pragmatic implications of an utterance, possibly not mentioned in the words at all. The term taken from the philosopher H.P. Grice (1913-1988), who developed the theory of the cooperative principle. On the basis that speaker and listener are cooperating and aiming to be relevant, a speaker may well imply something that he or she does not actually even refer to, confident that the listener will understand. Thus the *conversational implicature* of *Are you watching this programme?* might well be *This programme bores me. Can we turn the television off?* [Chalker, Weinur, 1998:198]. The process of communication is a process whereby the speaker conveys his or her meaning to the addressee. The speaker's situation is much easier: he or she puts his/her meaning into a code, i.e. gives it appropriate linguistic expression [Valeika, Verikaite 2010:69].

DISCUSSION

The addressee has to decode the linguistic structure. The task of the addressee is often made more difficult when the speaker's linguistic structure means more than it says literally. To put it in pragmatic terms, the decoding process is made more complicated by *implicature*, which is generally defined as a meaning a sentence may have that is distinct from what the sentence says literally. Of such sentences we say that they communicate more than they actually say. In other words, implicature is a meaning imposed by the speaker on the literal meaning of the sentence. Consider:

A. *Are you going to the faculty today?*

B. *I have to stay in bed.*

The implicature "*I am not going to the faculty today*" is said to be conversational: it depends on the conversational context whose key feature is the question "*Are you going to the faculty today?*"

Grice distinguished between a *conversational implicature* and a *conventional implicature* by which he meant one that is part of the meaning of the sentence used [Grice 1975:41-58].

The same analysis can be extended to *Even Ted came*. The particle *even* means *in addition/too/as well*. The conventional implicature is "*Ted's coming was the least expected*". If we consult a dictionary, we will find that all these additional meanings are dictionary ones, not situational (pragmatic). A dictionary includes all non-situational meanings. Only meanings that are generated in the situation by the speaker are the object of pragmatics proper- the field of linguistics concerned with the situational meanings of linguistic structures. Such being the case, the so-called conventional implicature should be the object of clause semantics, not sentence (contextualized clause) semantics

"Oh, it wasn't that," she hastened to explain, in turn. "Your hands seemed too small for your body." [London J. Martin Eden. <http://www.freeclassicebooks.com/>. P. 17].

In this context, the speaker is negating or rejecting a possible interpretation that the listener might have had about the reason for something. The phrase "Oh, it wasn't that" suggests that the listener may have made an assumption or guess about a particular issue, and the speaker is now clarifying that the assumption is incorrect.

The implicature here arises from what is not explicitly stated. The listener is left to infer what the original assumption might have been. The subsequent explanation, "Your hands seemed too small for your body," provides more information about the perceived issue or concern. The implicature is that the size of the listener's hands is somehow relevant or notable in the speaker's perception.

In implicature analysis, it's important to consider the context and the unspoken assumptions or expectations that the speaker is addressing. In this case, the speaker is using implicature to clarify and correct a potential misunderstanding or assumption about the listener's hands and their proportion to the body.

"I don't care," she sniffled. "Tom was a good boy." Her husband glared at her. This was unqualified defiance. [London J. Martin Eden. <http://www.freeclassicebooks.com/> . P. 28].

In this context, the wife's statement "I don't care" is a straightforward expression of her lack of concern, perhaps in response to something related to Tom. However, it is the husband's reaction that adds depth to the communication.

The husband's glare and the subsequent description of "This was unqualified defiance" imply that there is an unspoken conflict or tension between the wife and the husband. The implicature here is that the husband expected a different response from the wife, possibly a more emotional or caring reaction. The wife's apparent indifference, as conveyed by "I don't care," goes against the husband's expectations and norms for expressing emotions in this context.

The phrase "unqualified defiance" suggests a strong and direct opposition to what the husband might have hoped for or expected from the wife. The implicature lies in the husband's reaction, and it invites the reader to infer the underlying emotional dynamics and potential disagreement between the characters.

In implicature analysis, it's important to pay attention to the unstated meanings and emotions conveyed through the characters' actions and reactions, as they often provide insight into the nuances of the situation.

Speaker 1: 'Did Mr. Darcy give you reasons for this interference?'

Speaker 2: 'I understood that there were some very strong objections against the lady.' [Austen J. Pride and Prejudice. -London: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2004. -432p. -P.232]

In this context, Speaker 1 is inquiring about the reasons behind Mr. Darcy's interference, and Speaker 2 responds with the information that there were strong objections against the lady.

The implicature here is that Mr. Darcy's interference is linked to these strong objections against the lady. The nature of these objections is not explicitly stated, but the use of the word "objections" implies that there are reasons or concerns that Mr. Darcy has against the lady in question. The implicature invites the reader to infer the specifics of these objections and the potential impact they may have on the unfolding events in the story.

Implicature often relies on the reader's ability to fill in the gaps and deduce meaning from the context. In this case, the implicature adds a layer of mystery or intrigue to the narrative, as the reader is left to speculate about the nature of the objections and how they might influence the characters' relationships and actions.

Information about meaning, which is inextricably linked with the content direction of the text and has a pragmatic value that reflects the inner intention of the speaker, has not been researched in Uzbek linguistics. At the same time, the meaning and its various forms are evident in the following sentences used in colloquial speech: "“Qizim, senga aytaman, kelinim, sen eshit”, “Bu bilan nima demoqchisan?”, “U nimaga shama qilyapti?”, “U nimaga luqma tashlayapti?”. In these examples, it can be seen that there is a level of meaning in the content of expressions in live communication of the Uzbek language [Hakimov, 2013:76-77].

— Hazilni qo'yning, - dedi shu guldek qizarg'an Ra'no, - Shahid semiz nima uchun kelgan ekan, sizni mirzaboshi qilmoqchilar shekillik? (B 31.) (Qodiriy A. Mehrobdan chayon. -T.: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti

— Otabek, uyalmay, tortinmay javob beringiz; bu gal Toshkanddan chiqishingizdagi asl maqsadingiz nimaga edi? (83 bet) (Qodiriy A. O'tkan kunlar. www.ziyouz.com kutubxonasi)

We can see conversational implicature meanings in above-mentioned underlined examples which are taken from Uzbek literary texts.

CONCLUSION

The text introduces the concept of pragmatics, which explores the relationship between linguistic forms and their users. Within the context of literary texts, pragmatics is described as a set of authorial intentions expressed through linguistic means to influence readers, emphasizing the depth of interpretation required. Furthermore, the text introduces the notion of implicature, a pragmatic term that plays a significant role in conveying meaning within a text.

The concept of implicature is defined as the speaker conveying more than the explicit meaning of their words, leading to an additional suggested meaning beyond the literal statement. The text distinguishes between conventional and conversational implicatures, with a focus on the latter in the context of this discussion. Conversational implicatures are seen as deriving from general conditions governing proper conversational conduct.

The generation of implicatures, emphasizing the importance of a principled mechanism to explain their occurrence in communication are related to both languages as English and Uzbek. Additionally, it notes that implicature is a dynamic element of meaning, subject to change the text.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Griffiths, P. (2006). An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics, 193.
- [2] Lyons, J. (1979). Semantics. Volume 2, 539.
- [3] Cruse, A. (2000). Meaning in language. An introduction to semantics and pragmatics, 424.
- [4] Chalker, S., Weinur, E. (1998). The Oxford dictionary of English grammar, 461.
- [5] Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Syntax and semantics, 41-58.
- [6] Valeika, L., Verikaite, D. (2010). An introduction course in linguistic pragmatics, 164.
- [7] Safarov, Sh.S. (2008). Pragmalingvistika, 300.
- [8] Дотмурзиева, З.С. (2006). Прагматика англоязычного художественного текста и проблемы прагматики его перевода, 8.
- [9] Гальперин, И.П. (2004). Текст как объект лингвистического исследования, 18.
- [10] Hakimov, M. (2013). O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari, 172.
- [11] Shermatov, A.A. (2023). Matn yarialishida deysis salmog'i. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, 2(87), 10-13.
- [12] Шерматов, А.А. (2013). Инглиз ва ўзбек бадий матнларида дискурс дейксисининг қиёсий таҳлиliga доир айрим мулоҳазалар. Конференция материаллари, 234-237.
- [13] Shermatov, A.A. (2022). Ilmiy matnlarda adresant va adresatning implisit ifodalanishlari xususida. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, 1(82), 8-11.