



Linguopragmatics In Modern Linguistics: Unpacking Implicature And Context in Communication

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITTED 22 May 2025

ACCEPTED 20 June 2025

PUBLISHED 22 July 2025

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue 07 2025

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 License.

 Dilrabo Nazirqulova Zafariddin qizi

Independent researcher in Uzbekistan, State world languages university, Uzbekistan

Abduvahobova Mahina Ozodxonovna

PhD, docent Uzbekistan State world language university, English language faculty 2, the head of the department, "Theoretical disciplines of English language 2", Uzbekistan

Abstract: The main purpose of this article is conveying and giving valuable information about mostly researched part, field of modern linguistics. It is obvious that, contemporary researches done by various linguists is mainly directed to reveal new perspectives, features of pragmalinguistics. Numerous scientists did a lot of researches in this field of linguistics, and their analyzing methods, results can be used in our scientific works too. In this article, looking through linguopragmatics in Uzbek modern linguistics, opens new ways, new opportunities to young scholars and encourage to investigate new ideas, new approaches in this very field.

Keywords: Linguistics, languages, English, Uzbek, linguopragmatics, linguistic tools, discourse, implicature, text, context, maxims.

Introduction: As the modern world around us is developing and evolving very fast with its new technologies, innovations and new investigations, modern sciences are also coming into the scientific scene. Linguopragmatics is the product of such new researches, studies in the field of modern linguistics. Linguopragmatics is the subfield of modern linguistics that mainly deals with the language, its usage and intentions in communication. In linguopragmatics, the factor of human is foregrounded, as his/her intentions,

feelings, character, mood and the atmosphere around them affects to the communication. Learning the human, speech and other important factors during the conversation gave priority to studying the field of linguopragmatics.

Literature review

One of the early founders of pragmatics movement, Charls Morris, first distinguished three distinct branches of research, including the general form of the science of signs or semiotics: syntactic(or syntax) or that is, "the science of the formal relationship of signs to each other", semantics- " the science of the relationship of linguistic signs to the objects they are used for, that is, to the objects they signify" (their meanings), and pragmatics, that is, "the science of the relationship of signs to the interpreter"[Levinson 2008:1]

Qinghuan Deng, a linguist from China wrote an article devoted to book review of Verschueren's Handbook of Pragmatics, and gave some analysis about the origin, and key notions of pragmatics. According to Verschueren and Jan-Ola Ostman, who are the editors of The handbook of Pragmatics, the discipline of pragmatics originated from the unification of semiotics with different disciplines. Verschueren argues, that pragmatics initially took as its subject, those topics which could not be suitably explored with syntax, semantics and after some times it interacted in various ways with a number of disciplines.[Qinghuan Deng:2011]

Qinghuan Deng assumes that, in accordance with the above given historical overviews of pragmatics, Verschueren proposes to pursue a functional perspective on language-paying special attention to language use. That is, to make "making choices" in communication as the core concept of current work. According to him the interpretation of "making choices" involves three hierarchically related notions: variability, negotiability and adaptability, which are considered to be "the interrelated properties of the overall investigation for linguistic pragmatics, the functionality of language" [Verschueren 2009:20, Q. Deng:2011]

George Yule, one of the prominent scientists in the world of linguistics said that "Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. In the three-part distinction that indicates to semantics, syntax and pragmatics, only pragmatics allows humans into the analysis. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of actions (for example, requests) that they are

performing when they speak"[Yule:1996:4,Ngô]

Nicholas Allott & Deirdre Wilson analyzed Chomsky's works and his influence to pragmatics, and pointed out that, according to Chomsky, "If intuition is any guide, there seems to be a considerable gap between the semantic resources of language literally interpreted and thoughts expressed using them". They emphasized that pragmatic processes crucially rely on background or contextual information supplied by the hearer, which may significantly affect the outcome of the comprehension process. [Allott & Wilson:2021]

Uzbek scientist M. Khakimov in his monograph "The fundamentals of Pragmalinguistics" assumes that, "a number of additional meanings understood from specific sentences, are inextricably linked to the speech situation and context. Such meanings which are inextricably linked to the speech situation and context, and the means of expressing them are the object of study of linguistics pragmatics" [Khakimov:2013]

Another Uzbek scientist, who did research in the field of linguopragmatics, Sh. Safarov, focuses on communicative strategies and their implications for pragmatics in language use. His research provides frameworks for analyzing how speakers employ various strategies to achieve specific conversational goals. Safarov's insights align closely with the principles of linguopragmatics by illustrating how contextual factors influence strategic choices in communication. His analyses contribute to understanding the dynamics of language interaction and how pragmatics can inform practical applications in real-world communicative exchanges. [Safarov:2015]

Sayyora Azimova Xusanboyevna devoted one of her articles to the topic of "Linguopragmatic properties of language" and highlighted some statements, opinions of different scholars who have done researches on this topic. She concludes her review on the topic with such words that were cited from Aznaurova's work:

No matter how diverse the definition of pragmalinguistics may be, researchers agree on the following basic ideas:

- The basic point of the description of communicative activity is the concept of activity;
- Language is a means of activating the interaction of the participants of communication;
- The occurrence of linguistic activity is a phenomenon directly related to the communication environment. [Aznaurova:1988]

METHODOLOGY

Analyzing and finding some valuable information about the emergence and theoretical background of linguopragmatics, required looking through the works

of European and Uzbek prominent linguists, such as A.S.Levinson, S.J.Austin, Searle, Verschueren, G.Yule, Qinghuan Deng, M.Khakimov, Sh.Safarov and etc. As for the methods, discourse analysis, descriptive methods were used in this research.

RESULTS

The works that have been studied and researched during our research, gave some conclusions that the core principles of this field in contemporary linguistic studies include speech act theory by J.Austin and Searle, P.Grice's cooperative principle, discourse, deixis, implicature, presupposition and pragmatic competence. The theoretical framework encompasses various aspects of language use, such as how language is used to perform actions, convey meaning and create coherence in communication. The first component of linguopragmatics speech act was firstly introduced by J.Austin in his work "How to do things with Words" published in 1962.

S.Azimova indicates that, "Speech acts are the essence of pragmatism. The emergence of the concepts of speech act is the theoretical basis for linguistic pragmatics. The speech act is made up of certain subgroups in terms of semiological speech, which again form an internal microsystem and reunited into a larger system based on certain principles of speech act." [Azimova:2021]

According to Richard Nordquist, speech act theory is the branch of linguopragmatics, that studies how words are utilized not only to present information, but also to carry out actions. [Nordquist:2024]. He assumes that, Speech act theory was firstly introduced by Oxford philosopher J.L.Austin in "How To Do Things With Words" and further developed by American philosopher John Searle. The theory considers the degree to which utterances are said to perform locutionary, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary act. [Nordquist:2024]

Nader Hanna and Deborah Richards in their article named "Speech act theory as an or human-agent communication" implied that, the main idea of Speech Act theory is that, during communication people do not just utter propositions to be answered with acceptance or rejection. Instead, every exchanged sentence, in a communication situation includes the intention of the speaker to accomplish something, such as requesting, advising and so on. [Hanna, Richards:2019]

Austin delineated three attributes of utterances that commence with linguistic elements and culminate in their impact on a recipient. These characteristics encompass the initial formation of statements using words and the subsequent influence they exert on the

audience. Austin emphasized the importance of understanding the process by which words are used to create meaningful communication. By examining the relationship between words and their effect on the listener, one can gain insight into the dynamics of effective communication. [Hanna,Richards:2019]

1.Locutionary acts refer to the physical act of producing a sentence. this encompasses the articulation of words and sounds that form a coherent linguistic expression. These acts are fundamental in communication as they represent the basic building blocks of language use. They involve the physical manifestation of language through speech or writing.

2.Illocutionary acts refer to the communication of the speaker's intended meaning, including informing, ordering, warning and undertaking. These acts are a way for speakers to convey their intentions through speech.

3. The perlocutionary effect encompasses various outcomes such as providing information on a potential action, reporting the completion of a task, or influencing someone's perspective. The perlocutionary effect can involve informing about a future course of action, reporting task completion or persuading others to adopt a particular viewpoint.

Another contributor of speech act theory, John Searle, established a classification of illocutionary speech acts that covers wider variety of intentions of utterances. Let's consider the Searle's classification of illocutionary speech acts [Searle:1969]:

-Comissives-speech acts that commit a speaker to performing an action. E.g: promises

-Declarations-speech acts that bring something about in the world, e.g.pronouncing something

-Directives-speech acts that influence the listener to take a particular action, e.g. requests, commands and advice.

-Expressives-speech acts that represent the speaker's psychological state or attitudes towards a proposition, and which have an impact on the listener, e.g. congratulations, excuses and thanking

-Representatives-speech acts that express the state of the speaker. [Hannah & Richards:2019]

Knowing and using these types of illocutionary speech acts provides interlocutors with accurate, concise and fruitful conversation.

Another key component of linguopragmatics is context and communicative situation. Understanding and analyzing the setting and circumstances in which communication occurs is crucial for interpreting meaning. What the speaker wants to convey in the situation and what actually means the context, and

what factors can influence on the communicative situation and knowing these features give the chance of easily getting the situational conversation and its meaning.

Intention and communicative purpose are also form the key components of linguopragmatics. Before beginning the communication, interlocutors determine their intentions and communicative purpose that was intended from the conversation.

One of the essential notions of linguopragmatics that is researched and studied by linguists, is the study of communication postulates, that is the principles or rules of normal human communication. The notion "communication postulates" was introduced by H.P. Grice. Such communicative postulates or more common version of it "maxims" indicate behavioral rules, etiquette, manner of the people in the process of communication. Such maxims, behavioral rules are based on the principle of cooperation, correlation, collaboration and specific regulations. [Alihasanova, 2025]

Another crucial aspect of linguopragmatics is the notion of implicature. Implicatures have a great role in enhancing communication efficiency by conveying meaning beyond literal expressions. Implicatures can be classified into two main types: conversational and conventional. Conversational implicatures are mainly based on the cooperative principle and maxims of cooperation proposed by Grice which were highlighted above. Christopher Potts in his book "Conventional implicatures, a distinguished class of meanings" takes a fresh look into the old description of the term and suggests that, "The pragmatic theory of Grice 1975 takes the form of an overarching cooperative principle and a set of maxims. Together these help to shape both linguistic and non-linguistic social interactions. The theory is thus tailored to describing conversational implicatures, a class of non-lexical meanings whose presence and nature are contextually determined and negotiable. In contrast, Conventional implicatures trace back to individual lexical items and have the force of entailments." [Potts, 2005]

Antone Decressac in his article devoted to identify the difference between conventional and conversational implicatures, indicates that Grice's definition of implicature as a way of suggesting or implying something in conversation without outright stating it and adds that it is the unspoken part of communication that mainly relies on shared knowledge, context and social norms. [Decressac, 2024]

Here, giving the definition of implicature, he comes up with the example of implicature:

A. "Did you finish the report?"

B. "I managed to organize my desk" [Decressac, 2024]

Analyzing the example more concisely and deeply, we can state that, the speaker is speaking about his/her unfinished task with implied way. That's, it's obvious from the dialogue that the partner of the speaker hasn't finished the work yet, even if, he/she didn't speak about it directly. The above given dialogue is a good example of conversational implicature. In order to understand the distinction between conversational implicature and conventional one, one more example of implicature should be examined.

According to Decressac, the conventional implicature is linked with specific words or phrases used in a sentence. He points out that, this type of implicature is conventionally associated with the meaning of certain expressions. It can be understood that, this implicature is the part of the conventional meaning of the words themselves, rather than being extracted from the context or the speaker's intentions. [Decressac, 2024]

Let's consider some examples in order to understand the distinction between conventional and conversational implicature:

A. "Did you finish the report?"

B. "I managed to organize my desk" [Decressac, 2024]

Another example taken from the article of Davis Wayne, "Implicature", we can comprehend the total expression of conversational type of implicature:

Alan: "Are you going to Paul's party?"

Barb: "I have to work."

This example shows that, Barb is not going to Paul's party and she is not intending to go there absolutely, by saying that she has to work. Answering the question with her necessity to work is reflected with the help of implicature. Here Wayne includes the Grice's introduction the terms implicate and implicature for the case in which what the speaker said is distinct from what the speaker thereby meant or implied. [Abbot, 2006] Thus, Barb is conveying her not going to the party through her utterance and that, she is not going was implicature. In this example, we can see a very good pattern of conversational implicature. Here, the interlocutor of the speaker is not answering to the question directly. He is speaking about his lack of time to do his report with the help of implicature. It can be comprehended from the answer that he hasn't finished the work yet.

As for the type of conventional implicatures, it is suggested that, conventional implicatures unlike the conversational ones, linked to specific words and phrases used in a sentence. According to Moeschler's

indication, conventional implicatures can be represented with different ways. He in the article of "Conventional and conversational implicatures" analyzed the definitions of the main aspects of linguopragmatics and present some excerpts from Grice's definitions. "in some cases the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said. If I say (smugly), He is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave. I have certainly committed myself, by virtue of the meaning of my words to its being the case that his being brave is a consequence of (follows from) his being an Englishman" [Grice1975:44]

Several linguistic tools can be used in the sentence in order to express conventional implicature. Looking more concisely, and concluding from the above given statements of linguopragmatic scholars, to the description of conventional implicature, we can suggest that, this type of implicature can be considered as a linguistic concept that refers to meaning that is not directly stated in a sentence, but is implied based on conventional rules or norms of language use. The expression of conventional implicature relies on specific linguistic tools that are used by interlocutors. Such linguistic tools, phrases help convey additional meaning beyond the literal interpretation of the words used.

The following part of the research is covered with some linguistic and grammatical tools that express conventional implicature, and in order to illustrate our statements we have come up with precise samples.

One of the common grammatical tools in conveying conventional implicatures is the usage of adverbs and adverbial phrases in the utterance. For instance, the use of the adverb "surprisingly" in the sentence gives totally implicature to the meaning.

Example: Surprisingly, Ann has finished the task on time.

Entailment: Ann has finished the work

Conventional implicature: It is least likely that Ann finishes the task on time, as she often puts off doing her tasks.

Another linguistic tools that can be considered as the tools of expressing conventional implicature, are the words "therefore", "but", and "even", "however" which give additional information that serves to enrich the meaning of the utterance.

For ex: Even John knows the answer. In this example it is understood, that, John's knowing the answer is totally unpredictable and unexpected. And conventional implicature here is John is the least likely person to know the answer.

This was a hard thing to bear, but this was nothing. (Dickens, Great expectations)

Here the usage of the conjunction "but" is giving the meaning of contrast to the utterance.

The study of conventional and conversational implicatures gave the comprehension about the importance of them in speech communication, and created a more concise distinction in our scientific knowledge. Briefly, we can sum up that, conversational implicatures are totally context-centered, that they can't be easily canceled as they are connected with contextual inference, whereas, conventional implicatures are context-independent, as they maintain consistency across different conversational contexts due to their inherent encoding in the language. This encoding insures that the implicatures are conveyed consistently regardless of the specific context of the conversation.

Implicatures are mainly used in order to create fruitful conversation among people and it can be considered as the best way of conveying nuanced meanings and avoiding direct confrontation.

CONCLUSION

Taking all the things into consideration, Linguopragmatics as an interdisciplinary domain at the intersection of linguistics and pragmatics, plays a crucial role in understanding the complexities of language use in social contexts. The significance of this field of study lies mainly in the interpretation of meaning that is constructed not only by linguistic structures, but also through the interplay of context, speaker intentions, and social norms.

REFERENCES

- Levinson S.C. Pragmatics-Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2008
- Qinghuan Deng. Key notions for Pragmatics: [Fuel and Energy Abstracts](#) 43(9):2474–2476, 2011
- Verschueren J, Ostman Jan-Ola, Handbook of Pragmatics, 21st annual installment: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001
- Verschueren J. *Understanding Pragmatics*. (Understanding language series.) London: Arnold; New York: Oxford University Press/
- Yule G. Pragmatics. Oxford-Oxford University Press, 1996
- Việt Anh Ngô, Yule G. Pragmatics, https://www.academia.edu/60254109/Yule_George_Pragmatics
- Allott, Nicholas & Wilson, Deirdre. Chomsky and Pragmatics. In Nicholas Allott, Terje Lohndal & Georges Rey, A Companion to Chomsky. Wiley. 2021, pp. 433–447.

- Khakimov M. Fundamentals of pragmalinguistics – Toshkent. Akademnashr 2013-176b
- Safarov.Sh, Pragmalingvistika-Toshkent.2015
- Xusanboevna, S. A. Linguopragmatic Properties of Language. International Journal of Discoveries and Innovations in Applied Sciences, 1(4), 10-12. 2021
- AznaurovaE.S.The pragmatics of the artistic word.- Tashkent:Subject,1988.-p28
- Austin, J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Clarendon Press. 1962
- Nordquist, Richard. (2024, June 7). What Is The Speech Act Theory: Definition and Examples.Retrievedfrom<https://www.thoughtco.com/speech-act-theory-1691986>
- Hanna, N., & Richards, D. (2019). Speech Act Theory as an evaluation tool for human-agent communication. *Algorithms*, 12(4), 1-17. Article 79. <https://doi.org/10.3390/a12040079>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: CambridgeUniversityPress.
- Alikhasanova Z.F. Linguopragmatics in the system of linguistic sciences,2025
- Potts Ch. Conventional implicatures, a distinguished meaning, Oxford university press, 2005
- Decressac A. Conventional vs Conversational Implicature: What's the Difference? 2024 <https://medium.com/@adecressac/whats-left-unsaid-conventional-vs-conversational-implicature-bc2eaa11b6ef>, 23.03.2025
- Davis, Wayne, "Implicature", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2024 Edition), Edward N. Zalta& Uri Nodelman (eds.), URL<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2024/entries/implicature/>>.
- Abbott, Barbara, 2006, "Where Have Some of the Presuppositions Gone?", in Birner& Ward 2006: 1–20.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41-58). NewYork: AcademicPress.