Міністерство освіти і науки України

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

КУРСОВА РОБОТА

на тему: **ТЕОРІЯ ІМПЛІКАТУР ПОЛА ГРАЙСА**

Студентки групи Мл03-19
факультету германської філології і перекладу
денної форми навчання
спеціальності 035 філологія
спеціалізація Германські мови та літератури
(переклад включно) перша – англійська
Чуйко А.С.

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук,
професор
Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів: _____Оцінка: ЄКТС _____

Члени комісії _____ _____
                (підпис)   (прізвище та ініціали)

_____ _____
                (підпис)   (прізвище та ініціали)

_____ _____
                (підпис)   (прізвище та ініціали)

м. Київ 2023 р.

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Course Paper

Theory of Implicature by Paul Grice

ANASTASIIA CHUIKO

Group Mla 03-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Prof. **LIDIIA VOLKOVA**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This research paper seeks to explore the development of Grice's theory of implicature, its philosophical basis, and its influence on the field of linguistics. The research will focus on the theory's core elements, such as the cooperative principle and four categories of conversational maxims, as well as its two subtypes of implicature: conversational and conventional.

Grice's theory of implicature was first introduced in 1967 by the philosopher, Paul Grice. He proposed that in conversation, participants adhere to a set of principles which enable them to interpret each other's meaning. He argued that communication is based on the expectation that each individual will attempt to interpret what the other is saying in terms of their respective intentions, rather than the literal meaning of their words. This idea of "implicature" allows the conversation to go beyond the literal interpretations of words.

The relevance of my research lies in the Theory of Implicature, which is a well-known concept in language and communication. This theory tries to explain how speakers and listeners can understand and create statements that go beyond the literal meaning of the words used. The Theory of Implicature provides useful insights into the complexities of communication and has implications for linguistics, discourse analysis, and the study of conversation.

The Theory of Implicature has significant implications for the study of linguistics and communication, as it provides a useful framework for understanding the complexities of communication.

The **aim** of the research is to examine Grice's theory of implicature in order to gain a better understanding of how language is used to express meaning in conversation.

The objectives of the research are:
– to explore the philosophical basis of the theory and its influence on linguistics;

– to identify the core elements of the theory, including the cooperative principle and four categories of conversational maxims;

– to analyze two subtypes of implicature.

The **object** of this research is Grice's theory of implicature.

The **subject** of my Course Paper is the development of Grice's theory of implicature, its philosophical basis, influence, and core elements.

The **theoretical significance** of my work can be explained by the fact my research paper will provide a comprehensive overview of the development of the theory and its implications for the study of linguistics. By performing an in-depth investigation of the fundamental ideas of the theory and how it affects linguistics, as well as thoroughly analyzing its core components and the two different types of implicature, the study will provide a better understanding of the theoretical implications of the theory and its implications for the field of linguistics.

CHAPTER ONE. THE DEVELOPMENT OF GRICE'S THEORY OF IMPLICATURE

1.1. Overview of the Theory of Implicature. Philosophical Basis of the Theory

In pragmatics, a field of study related to linguistics, an implicature is something that is implied or suggested by a speaker's words, even though it is not directly stated. Implicatures help us to communicate more effectively than if we were to explain everything in detail (Davis, 2019).

In the Preface to "Studies in the Way of Words", Grice tells us that his approach is centred around the use of natural language. This form of philosophy, known as ordinary language philosophy, looks at how language is used in everyday life, in contrast to formal language (Blackburn, 1996). To get a better sense of Grice's theory of implicature and meaning, we need to distinguish between ideal language philosophy and ordinary language philosophy.

During Grice's time, the difference between ordinary language philosophy and ideal language philosophy was a key point of argument in analytic philosophy, and it still remains a crucial issue today. This distinction is about the methods used to investigate philosophical questions.

According to Lüthi (2006, p. 250), proponents of ideal language philosophy (ILP) believe that the focus of philosophical inquiry should be on the language used in the fields of natural and formal sciences; that is, their main objective is to deconstruct scientific statements. They maintain that ordinary language can be too vague, obscure, and flawed, while formal languages of logic and math are succinct and ordered.

In contrast, ordinary language philosophy (OLP) concentrates on everyday language use, or how people typically communicate in their day-to-day life (Lüthi, 2006, p. 250). OLP does not rely on scientific discourse as the foundation for its investigations, but that does not mean it ignores its significance.

At Oxford, Grice was part of the ordinary language philosophy movement, but he also pointed out that this approach lacked the ability to differentiate between semantic and pragmatic implications (Neale, 1992, p. 9). He proposed that it is important to understand the subtle nuances of language and to be able to recognize the perceived meaning of a statement and the intention of the speaker. He suggested a new approach to language which would involve multiple language analyses. Chapman (2005, p. 90) observed that Grice's idea that the gap between standard meaning and speaker meaning is not as random as it appeared sparked an inventive approach to examining this distinction, which he argued could be beneficial.

The aim of Grice's theory was to explain why certain utterances are incorrect. He was attempting to differentiate between a statement that is incorrect due to not being accurate to the facts and one that is unacceptable for another reason (Grice, 1989, p. 4).

The importance of Grice's theory is based on his proposal "that speaker's meaning was relevant to philosophy and could be properly studied in its own right" (Sperber Dan and Wilson, 2012, p. 26). When it came to discussing the philosophy of language, it was generally overlooked that the speaker's intention could be explored. This assumption was made that the speaker's meaning was beyond investigation.

Wilson and Sperber (2012, p. 26) note that Grice believed meaning to be a "psychological phenomenon", in contrast to some other philosophers of language who viewed the exploration of natural language as purely linguistic. This would lead to a more thorough examination of a particular language feature, while Grice attempted a broader exploration of language, looking at how language is typically used, as well as how it is employed by an individual speaker.

In Grice's 1989 publication Logic and Conversation, the concept of "implicature" was introduced, which involves implying, the verb "implicate" and the noun "implicatum" (Grice, 1989, p. 24). Grice's idea of meaning is related to his ideas on the purpose of the individual speaking and how it impacts the

interpretation of language. He posited that there were two types of meaning: utterer's and timeless meaning. Furthermore, he explored the distinction between nonconventional and conventional meanings, as well as the range of the speaker's intentions. Grice's theory of implicature was built on the idea that people participating in a conversation share a common goal and adhere to certain communication guidelines, as proposed by his concept of meaning and the Cooperative Principle. His primary methodological approach was used to develop the foundations of his interpretation of implicature, which is composed of a set of conversational maxims.

1.2. Criticisms and influence of Grice's Theory of Implicature

Grice's Theory of Implicature has had a significant effect on the advancement of pragmatics, however, it has also been the target of several criticisms. One of these criticisms is that it does not account for the numerous kinds of implied meanings which are prevalent in everyday language (Levinson, 2000). For example, Grice's theory does not account for why the strength of certain implicit meanings can be affected by the context in which they are used. Critics also argue that Grice's theory ignores the role of non-linguistic cues, such as body language, gestures, and facial expressions, in implicature (Sperber & Wilson, 1986, pp. 33-37).

An additional criticism of Grice's theory is that it fails to provide a precise definition of "conversational implicature" (Wilson, 1992). Rather than providing specific details, Grice discussed what was meant by a conversational implicature, which is the speaker's intention of conveying more than just the literal words said. His theory, however, has been criticized for not adequately explaining how implicatures result from the cooperative principle.

The Cooperative Principle supposes that people engaging in conversations are attempting to achieve a unified objective. However, Pinker (2007) notes that from a psychological or biological perspective, it is often not a guarantee that

everyone is working together. For instance, if one person is a prosecutor and the second one is a defendant, the prosecutor will not presume that the other individual is willing to work together. Even though two people may have a close relationship, they may still have different goals.

Communicating with others can have goals that are not simply to exchange data. For instance, one could engage in conversation simply to have a good time, often using humour or jokes to do this(Lepore, 2010). Because the focus is not on conveying knowledge, the Quality, Quantity, and Relation standards become irrelevant. If the Cooperative Principle does not apply because of one of these reasons, then any inferences made from it will be incorrect.

In conclusion, some scientists have argued that also other elements, such as individual beliefs, societal norms and the context in which communication happens, can be responsible for creating implicatures.

Despite these criticisms, Grice's Theory of Implicature remains a cornerstone of the field of pragmatics and continues to be widely influential. It is one of the most influential theories in linguistics, semiotics, and the philosophy of language.

Grice's theory has had a major impact on linguistics and communication studies. It has allowed for the development of many theories and models of communication, such as speech act theory (Tannen, 1984), which looks at the way language is used to communicate intentions, and cooperative principle theory, which looks at how people can cooperate in conversations.

Grice's principles have been employed to study how the external environment can have an impact on the understanding of communication. In addition, it has been used to illustrate how people can use implicit language to influence and motivate others.

Grice's notion of implicature is applicable to a variety of fields related to communication, including advertising. In advertising, it is often used to express a message without explicitly stating it. For instance, a commercial may feature a

person drinking a soft drink, implying that the product will refresh and invigorate the viewer.

Grice's theory of implicature has had a major effect on the use of language in storytelling. Depending on the context, certain words and phrases can take on a different significance, with an author implying something different than the literal sense of their words and conveying a deeper meaning.

To sum up, this idea that people use language strategically and hint at something without having to explicitly state it has been a major influence on linguistics.

CHAPTER TWO. THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE AND FOUR CATEGORIES OF CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS

2.1. The Cooperative Principle

The Cooperative Principle was first proposed by H. Paul Grice in his 1975 paper "Logic and Conversation", where he argued that conversations should not be just a "succession of disconnected remarks ", but rather should be rational in nature (Grice, 1975). This is a significant concept in conversation analysis, as it outlines the standard typically applied in conversations and explains how meaningful dialogue is characterized by collaboration between participants.

Any conversation involves a mutual exchange between two or more people, which may be seen as a "cooperative effort" (Grice, 1989, p. 26). In order to have a successful discussion, all parties should come together and work towards a unified objective. Keeping an open mind to different perspectives and attempting to find a mutually beneficial outcome is essential. It is important to ensure the dialogue is fruitful by employing techniques such as inquiring, repeating, and offering constructive feedback. All parties should be willing to both offer and accept ideas, taking into account the needs and aspirations of the other to ensure the conversation runs smoothly.

Cooperation among those involved in a conversation is an essential element of communication. This notion is expressed by Grice in the form of a maxim: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." (Grice, 1989, p. 26). The Cooperative Principle requires that individuals make sure their communication is understandable, appropriate, brief, and accurate. Encouraging open dialogue that is both effective and constructive is essential. People should make sure that the words they are using are relevant to the conversation and that their comments help to further the discussion. Additionally,

they must be succinct in their answers and make sure that their statements are truthful.

The Cooperative Principle is important for effective communication. By utilizing this concept, individuals can gain insight into one another's perspectives, working together to come to a consensus. This ensures that conversations are productive and successful, leading to meaningful exchanges.

In simple terms, the Cooperative Principle states that when people communicate, they should do so in a way that is mutually beneficial. This means that people should be honest, respectful, and open in their communication and that they should work together to get the best outcome for everyone involved.

2.2. Four categories of conversational maxims

The Gricean maxims are a set of four rational principles that explain the connection between utterances and their perception. They were formulated by Grice in order to ensure that conversations are meaningful and effective. The Maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relevance and Manner must be followed in order to ensure that the conversation goes smoothly and all parties involved can understand and appreciate the other's contributions. By abiding by these maxims, it is possible to create successful and effective communication.

The Maxim of Quality

The maxim of Quality states that speakers should be truthful when communicating and should not say anything that they know to be false or that is likely to be false. It emphasizes the importance of accuracy and truthfulness in communication and states that speakers should not try to deceive others by providing inaccurate information (Grice, 1989).

Two main rules are the following:

- Do not state anything you are unsure of as truth. If you decide to include any information that could potentially be inaccurate, make sure to indicate or express your doubts about its accuracy.

- Do not make any claims without having proof to back them up. Any information you are not sure of must not be included in your statement unless there is a valid explanation why. If you do include it, make sure to point out that you are uncertain of its correctness.

Different people may have different interpretations of the truth. Following the Maxim of Quality involves not deliberately giving false information. For instance, if someone says *"The longest river of Ukraine is the Dnieper",* they are sure that it is an accurate fact.

(1) "But I do believe that Tom is smart, and very, very cunning." (Hazelwood A. The Love Hypothesis, p.81).

In this statement, the speaker is adhering to this maxim by speaking truthfully (i.e. they genuinely believe that Tom is smart and cunning) and not misleading the listener. The use of the word 'believe' shows that the speaker is being sincere and not making false claims about Tom's intelligence, or that the speaker has evidence or reasons to support his or her opinion.

The Maxim of Quantity

It is essential to provide enough information to keep the conversation going without overwhelming the listeners with unnecessary details. The general principle here is to be informative in your comments.

Two main rules are the following:

- Provide as much detail as possible when making your contribution to the conversation. Ensure that you give all the relevant information to ensure the conversation flows smoothly. Make sure to include everything that is necessary and do not leave anything out.

- Do not give more details than necessary. Do not include any information that is not relevant to the conversation.

For instance, if someone asks how to get somewhere you should provide them with enough details so they can understand how to get there, without any unnecessary information.

(2) A: "How to get onto the platform?"

B: "All you have to do is walk straight until you reach the barrier between platforms nine and ten."

This reply is usually an adequate response, furnishing the essential details without any extra information.

(3) A: "How to get onto the platform?"

B: "Keep walking."

In this dialogue, B has violated Grice's maxim of Quantity. B's response does not give A the required amount of information, as A was expecting a more detailed explanation. B should have specified the direction and distance to the platform for A.

(4) A: "How to get onto the platform?"

B: "Not to worry," she said. "All you have to do is walk straight at the barrier between platforms nine and ten. Don't stop and don't be scared you'll crash into it, that's very important. Best do it at a bit of a run if you're nervous. Go on, go now before Ron." (Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, p. 72)

Finally, in this example, the answer has too many facts, violating the second maxim of quantity. B provides more information than A requested. Person A only asked how to get onto the platform, but B provides detailed instructions on how to do it, including not being scared and running if one is nervous.

The Maxim of Relation

The main rule here is the following:

- Be relevant. Be on point. Ensure that all the information you provide is connected to the existing discussion; do not include anything that is not relevant.

This Maxim assists in maintaining conversations focused and prevents unrelated discussions that have no flow. The Maxim of Relevance also helps us to comprehend statements in conversations that may not be easily apparent.

(5) A: "Is the security camera still broken?"

B: "I've been busy." (Hoover C. It starts with us, p. 7)

This example does not violate Grice's Maxim of Relevance, as the response is still relevant to the question. It could be interpreted as a negative answer, so this response implies that the speaker has been too busy to fix the security camera.

(6) A: "Is the security camera still broken?"

B: "I'm going to the beach this weekend."

We can rewrite this dialogue to show how the speaker can violate Grice's Maxim of Relevance, as the response is not directly related to the question. It does not provide an answer to the question and instead provides a statement unrelated to the conversation.

The Maxim of Manner

The main rules here are the following:

- Be perspicuous.

- Avoid obscurity of expression. Keep your language simple and clear. Avoid using unfamiliar words or phrases that might be hard to comprehend.

- Avoid ambiguity. Stay clear of anything that could be interpreted in multiple ways; this makes it hard for the person reading your message to comprehend what you're trying to say.

- Be brief. Keep your message concise so that the reader can focus on the important points.

- Be orderly. Give the information in an organized way so that it's easy to understand.

This Maxim is focused on how we communicate our message rather than what we say. We should be mindful of the words we choose and select ones that our listeners will understand. Additionally, we should make sure our message is clear and concise.

(7) "I did the Patronus Charm to get rid of the dementors," he said, forcing himself to remain calm. "It's the only thing that works against them."
(Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix, p. 36).

The speaker is aware that the listener may not be familiar with the necessity of Patronus Charm in such situations and is prepared to provide a quick explanation to make sure that the person can easily comprehend what he is trying to say.

CHAPTER THREE. CONVERSATIONAL AND CONVENTIONAL IMPLICATURES

3.1. Conversational implicature

Implicature is the main concept in Grice's theory of languages. According to Oxford Languages Online Dictionary, implicatures are "the action of implying a meaning beyond the literal sense of what is explicitly stated" and "implied meaning". Grice discusses the psychological nature of language and implicature in his Retrospective Epilogue (1989), stressing the necessity of the speaker having a valid reason to go against a conversational rule in a specific situation or at least thinking they do. He argues as well that the presence of an implicature does not always guarantee a violation of a maxim at every level. Although it may seem like it, a maxim was only broken in terms of what was said (conventional meaning), not what was meant. Ultimately, the fundamental functions of the maxims are respected.

Grice distinguishes between two types of implicature: conversational and conventional. Conversational implies can be further divided into two categories: particular and generalized. The main difference between them is the degree of conventionality that their implied meanings have (i.e. how commonly they are used and how easily they are assumed) (Grice, 1989, pp. 25-26).

When someone speaks, they may be suggesting something beyond what is expressly stated through conversational implicature. This is when they say one thing but imply something else. For instance, A is telling B that he has never lied to her implying that the answer to the first speaker's question is "no".

(8)   A: *"Is this for real?"*

B: *"Would I ever lie to you?"* (Hazelwood A. Below Zero, p.40)

In this dialogue, the second person is using conversational implicature to show that the answer to the first speaker's question is "no." This is because his statement implies that he has never lied to her in the past and, by extension, he is

not doing so now. This can be seen as a way of indirectly confirming the truthfulness of the previous question, as the speaker did not directly answer it, but rather implied that the answer was "no."

The second speaker is also suggesting that the first speaker should trust him. This is because he is implying that they have a history of being honest and trustworthy, which implies that the first speaker should believe them.

The conversational implicature in this dialogue is also used to show that the two speakers have some kind of relationship or connection. This is because the speaker's statement implies that they have known each other for some time and have an established level of trust between them. This suggests that the two have a strong bond and that they can rely on each other.

Here is another example of conversational implicature:

(9) *A: "You don't look exhausted."*

   B: "Good lighting." (Hoover C. It Starts with Us, p.21)

In this response *"Good lighting"* could imply that it only seems so because of the good lighting in the room, but in fact, the person feels tired and exhausted.

Grice posits that participants should adhere to a shared norm which he describes as the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975, p.26). This rule stops dialogue from being a string of unconnected statements and renders certain remarks inappropriate for the conversation.

Grice's concept of conversation as a regulated action serves as the basis for his explanation of how conversational implications are created. According to his theory, it is assumed that individuals will make comments that abide by the Cooperative Principle and its maxims. Interpreters must use their judgment when deciphering the speaker's intent. People will think about the direct interpretation of the phrase, the Cooperative Principle, and any applicable information to decide the speaker's purpose. They might think that the speaker is conveying something different than what was said, which would require them to make an assumption. Speakers can expect their words to be interpreted as something else and trust that

the interpreter will take into account these factors. In situations when it is not practicable to stick to every rule, implicature can be a helpful tool.

(10) *A: "Time doesn't heal the wounds. Sometimes it just turns them into scars."*

B: "Yeah, maybe." (Squires M. A Lake Holiday House)

The second speaker, in this dialogue, implies cooperating by providing some information, nevertheless, since she or he is not absolutely sure, so he or she withholds the maxim of quantity. This produces a maxim clash.

We can also choose to not adhere to the Cooperative Principle by being careful or ambiguous in our speech; this is to indicate to the other individual that we don't have absolute certainty about the data we are providing.

Let's imagine another situation. A is asking B for some information about a famous book she wants to write a review about. Mark does not have any evidence regarding the matter but has read something. To avoid advising something that could be inaccurate, B begins his response by being careful with his language. He or she may say something along the lines of "From my point of view...", "Seemingly...", or "For all I know...". By being cautious, B is indicating to A that the advice is not entirely accurate and should not be absolutely trusted. It is known as hedging.

When someone disregards the accepted standards of conversation, they are suggesting something beyond the actual words they use. This could be done by either giving too much data or on the contrary not enough. In either case, they are attempting to communicate an additional message.

(11) "As soon as I see him, I turn stone cold." (Hoover C. It Ends with Us, p.218)

Uttering clearly false information can be used to demonstrate different figures of speech. For example, it is impossible that the person turned into a stone. It is highly improbable that the speaker meant to deceive or be incorrect - the listener must comprehend that the speaker was utilizing a metaphor or simile.

Furthermore, Grice in Levinson (1983, p. 126) distinguish between two types of implicature: Generalized and Particularized. Particularized implicatures appear in specific contexts, while Generalized implicatures can be interpreted without reference to context. For example, using the article "a" indicates that there is no relationship between the speaker and the subject.

(12) *"I don't actually have a vehicle to put a tree in."* (Squires M. A Lake Holiday House)

In this sentence indefinite article "a" indicates that the speaker is not connected to the vehicle or tree; it can actually be any vehicle, as well as any tree. Let's look at some more examples.

Grice suggests that Generalized Implicature can be understood without any particular setting or situation. This that a deeper level of analysis or interpretation is not required. An example of this can be seen in the next conversation:

(13) *A: The dog seems so happy.*

   B: Perhaps it has eaten the chicken.

The true meaning of this conversation does not rely on any surrounding circumstances, so further examination is not necessary to comprehend its real significance.

In contrast, Particularized Implicature, as described by Grice, is an Implicature that results from a particular situation. Scholars in the linguistics field frequently focus on this kind of Implicature as it looks into how individuals utilize language to imply something without saying it and how listeners can understand the meaning of an implied statement. To put it more simply, Particularized Implicature examines how it is possible to suggest more than what is expressed explicitly. This can be demonstrated in the following dialogue:

(14) *A: Oh God, what happened to the chicken?*

   B: The dog seems so happy.

In this conversation, B's reply suggests something beyond the words being said. A must understand the underlying meaning in order to figure out that the dog has devoured the chicken, which explains its contented expression.

What is more interesting, conversational implicatures typically have a number of interesting properties, including calculability, cancelability, nondetachability, and indeterminacy (Allott, 2018). These properties can be applied to determine if a potential implication is indeed accurate.

Let's analyze them deeply and start with cancelability. This means that an implication can be reversed if it didn't come from a specific linguistic structure and is based on certain suppositions, as extra info or context can take precedence over it.

(15) 1: Those pancakes look so tasty!

2: Those pancakes look so tasty, but I'm on diet.

The first example might imply that "I want to eat one", but the second example is contradicted by the context that "I'm on a diet", so it means that "I won't eat any".

The notion of calculability implies that it is possible to trace an implicature back to its source in the utterance and the maxims.

And the final one is known as nondetachability and means that if the same truth-conditional content is conveyed in a different way, the same implicature should result. So here we take into consideration the sense and not the formulation. For example, we can change the previous variant:

(16) 1: Those pancakes look so tasty!

2: These cakes are so delicious!

3: The biscuits you cooked are amazing!

Here we can see different words used but in general, the implicature will be the same.

3.2. Conventional implicature

Grice also suggested the concept of conventional implicature, which does not depend on the four maxims or the cooperative principle, but instead has to do with the direct meaning of the words that are employed. Nevertheless, he never delved further into this idea.

Grice proposes that certain words, phrases, verbs, and grammar formats can have a customary, conventional interpretation which is independent of the four maxims and the cooperative principle. However, he did not provide any extensive explanation of this concept. For example, we can take such phrases as "but, although, however, nevertheless, moreover, anyway, whereas, after all, even, yet, still, besides", "deprive" and "spare" (Carston, 2002, p. 53).

(17) "Are you even listening? It is not real." (Hazelwood A. The Love Hypothesis, p.23).

The person is suggesting that the listener is not giving their full attention to the conversation and is not taking it seriously enough. 'Even' is used to emphasize this point, implying that the listener should be paying more attention. This could be interpreted as the person feeling frustrated or angry that the listener is not listening and not taking them seriously.

Conversational implicatures can be disregarded, but conventional implicatures cannot. In addition, some verbs are able to produce a conventional implicature.

(18) "This time, Olive managed to get out of the car." (Hazelwood A. The Love Hypothesis, p.82).

The conventional implicature of this sentence is that it was difficult for Olive to get out of the car, but she managed to do so successfully. The use of the word 'managed' implies that there was some sort of obstacle that she had to overcome in order to get out of the car. This implies that she was either physically unable, or there was an external circumstance that made it difficult for her to do so.

(19) "He failed my proposal." (Hazelwood A. The Love Hypothesis, p.35).

In this example, the use of the word "failed" implies that the proposal was not accepted or was unsuccessful.

The Grice-inspired theory of conventional implicature involves elements that contrast with conversational implicature. Grice identified three characteristics that define conventional implicatures (1989):

1. They are direct, meaning they do not involve inference or resolution of maxims.

2. Conventional implicatures are non-cancellable.

3. Conventional implicatures are detachable.

The Gricean hypothesis for conversational implicature is considered to be inferred, cancelable and non-detachable, implying that the syntactic properties of a sentence do not necessarily reflect the psychological reality due to context-free external meanings (Cole, 1976). Scholars believe that this implicature is associated with the taxonomy of pragmatics of logical constants such as quantity, quality, manner and relation (Edgington, 2006, pp. 569-587). This denotes that the speaker's use of phrases and sentences is related mostly to the meaning rather than to truth-evaluable content such as truth and falsity, highlighting the significant differences between two implicatures.

So, we can observe that there are some considerable differences between them. Conversational implicature relies on the four maxims of the cooperative principle while conventional implicature is not and instead is linked to the literal interpretation of words.

A person may utter one statement, yet mean something entirely different, a process called conversational implicature. Another implication is closely related to the literal interpretation of the spoken utterances. This is known as a conventional implicature. The first one can be overridden by further information; however, the second one is not able to be changed or cancelled.

Because of such differences between these two types, there are debates that "conventional implicatures" are not actually implicatures, but rather additional statements that are entailed by an utterance.

CONCLUSIONS

The Grice's Theory of Implicature has been instrumental in providing a framework for understanding the way in which language is used in conversation. The Cooperative Principle and four categories of conversational maxims provide insight into the way in which conversation takes place. Additionally, discourse analysis has been used to better understand how language is used in online communication, and to identify areas in which it can be improved.

The Grice's Theory of Implicature has been of particular interest due to its ability to explain the meaning that is communicated through conversation beyond the literal interpretation of the words. Through the analysis of conversational and conventional implicature, it is possible to gain a better understanding of the way in which meaning is conveyed. Moreover, the Cooperative Principle and four categories of conversational maxims help to explain the various strategies used by people when communicating with one another.

In conclusion, Grice's Theory of Implicature, the Cooperative Principle and four categories of conversational maxims, and discourse analysis have all been instrumental in providing insight into the way in which language is used in conversation. Each of these areas has been beneficial in improving the way in which people communicate with one another. As such, it is clear that these areas of research can continue to have a positive impact on the way in which people use language in their everyday lives.

RÉSUMÉ

Курсова робота на тему: Теорія Імплікатур Пола Грайса

Дослідження показало що теорія Імплікатур Грайса є суттєвим науковим поняття для розуміння взаємодії між учасниками спілкування. Охарактеризувавши принцип кооперації, максими Грайса, поняття імплікатури та її типи ми довели актуальність досліджень з сфери аналізу головних об'єктів вивчення лінгвістичної прагматики, а саме правил ведення комунікації.

У даній роботі було використано як приклади речення з творів відомих іноземних письменників, а саме Колін Гувер, Алі Гейзелвуд, Меган Скірес та Джоан Роулінг. Використання принципу кооперації та визначення імплікатур дозволило проаналізувати приклади комунікації, пояснити їх роботу та важливість, що є одним з ключових завдань лінгвістичної прагматики.

Курсова робота складається зі вступу, трьох розділів, висновку, резюме та списку використаних джерел. У першому розділі «Розвиток теорії імплікатур Пола Грайса» представлена характеристика теорії імплікатур та її вплив на дослідження сфери комунікації. У другому розділі «Принцип кооперації та чотири категорії максимів Грайса» представлена інформація про поняття кооперації, види максимів Грайса та їх детальний аналіз на базі сучасних творів художньої літератури. У третьому розділі «Конвенціональні та комунікативні імплікатури» представлена характеристика двох видів імплікатур та аналіз їх проявлення та впливу на процес комунікації.

У даній курсовій роботі всього:

Сторінок: 27.

Список використаних джерел: 20.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

Allott, N. (2018, January 24). *Conversational Implicature*. Retrieved from https://www.scilit.net/article/a5cc78bd76510f5b4c6e24e194b459c0

Blackburn, S. (1996). *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Chapman, S. (2005). *Paul Grice, Philosopher and linguist. .* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Cole, P. (1976). *The synchronic and Diachronic Status of Conversational Implicature, in Cole, P. and Morgan, J. L. (eds) Syntax and Semantics.* New York: Academic Press, pp. 257-288.

Davis, W. (2019). *Implicature. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/Archives/Sum2019/Entries/implicature/

Edgington, D. (2006). *The Pragmatics of the Logical Constants, in Lepore, E. and Smith, B.C. (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation. In D. Davidson & G. Harman (eds.), The Logic of Grammar, Encino, CA: Dickenson, 64-75. Reprinted in Grice 1989.*

Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lepore, E. a. (2010). *Against Metaphorical Meaning*. Topoi, 29(2): 165–180. doi:10.1007/s11245-009-9076-1.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: University Press.

Levinson, S. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lüthi, D. (2006). *"How Implicatures make Griece an unordinary language philosopher". Pragmatics. Volume 16 (issue 2-3, January 2006), pp.247-274.*

Neale, S. (1992). *"Paul Grice and the Philosophy of Language". Linguistics and Philosophy. Volume 15 (issue 5, October 1992), pp. 509-559.*

Pinker, S. (2007). The Evolutionary Social Psychology of Off-Record Indirect Speech Acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, pp. 437–461.

Sadock, J. M. (1976). *On testing for conversational implicature. In In P. Cole (ed.), Syntax and Semantics volume 9: Pragmatics.* New York: Academic Press.

Sperber Dan and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Sperber Dan and Wilson, D. (2012). *Meaning and Relevance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends. .* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wilson, D. &. (1992). *On Grice's theory of conversation. In P. Copp & J. Sicha (Eds.), Speech acts and conversational interaction (pp. 123–144).* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Science.