

CORRELATION OF THE INTENDED AND REFERENTIAL MEANINGS

The focus of study is the correlation implicative meaning (intention) of the speaker in the event of statements and inferential value of listening, which is formed in the course of his "perception" of this statement. Verbs "manage" and "fail" serve as an indicator of the interaction.

Key words: *implicative value, speaking, inference value, listener, semantics, corps, discourse, component structure.*

Михайленко В. В. Кореляція імплікативного та інференційного значення. – Стаття.

У фокусі дослідження знаходиться кореляція імплікативного значення (наміру) мовця під час виникнення висловлювання та інференційного значення слухача, яке формується в нього в процесі «прочитання» зазначеного висловлювання. Дієслова «manage» і «fail» служать індикатором такої взаємодії.

Ключові слова: *імплікативне значення, мовець, інференційне значення, слухач, семантика, корпус, дискурс, компонентна структура.*

Михайленко В. В. Корреляция импликативного и инференциального значения. – Статья.

В фокусе исследования находится корреляция импликативного значения (намерения) говорящего при возникновении высказывания и инференциального значения слушающего, которое формируется у него в процессе «восприятия» указанного высказывания. Глаголы «manage» и «fail» служат индикатором такого взаимодействия.

Ключевые слова: *импликативное значение, говорящий, инференциальное значение, слушатель, семантика, корпус, дискурс, компонентная структура.*

Introduction. Dynamic semantics of natural language can be seen as part of a larger construct: the study of how information in general is structured and exchanged. Such a study brings together results from diverse fields such as computer science, cognitive psychology, logic, linguistics, and artificial intelligence. The dynamic viewpoint has considerable merit here, and employs results that have been developed with an eye to other applications. This paper explores the interplay of conventional and interactional factors in the interpretation of utterances. It develops a formal framework, dynamic pragmatics [19], in which pragmatic inferences arise as contextual entailments in a dynamic system in which information states are updated with information about the occurrence of utterance events (in contrast to dynamic semantics, where information states are updated with the content of linguistic expressions). In this way, the framework is able to faithfully model Gricean pragmatic inference as interlocutors' reasoning about each other's utterance choices. The framework of dynamic pragmatics sheds a new light on the nature of conversational implicature, and language use in general [18, p. 6]. Grice (1975) presented his theory of conversational implicature, he had in mind the speaker-meaning-as-intention. The speaker means something by uttering X when s/he intends the addressee to produce a response, recognizing that this production of a response is what the speaker intends [11, p. 147–177]. This view is further supported by Grice's account of rational communicative behavior. It is reflected in his cooperative principle and maxims of conversation which capture the predictability of speaker's meaning, some aspects of which are context-free and some context-bound. The fact is that grammars seek to describe the structure of a sentence in isolation [10] from its possible settings in linguis-

tic discourse (written or verbal) or in non-linguistic contexts (social or physical) [17, p. 173–175], however it may lead to establishing pseudo-semantics of the sentence. This research is an attempt to capture the meaning of one of implicatures expressed by the phrase or composite predicate [3, p. 99–103] with implicative verbs *manage* or *fail* in discourse typology selected from the British National Corpus and W. Somerset Maugham's discourse represented by the novel "The Moon and Sixpence".

The "implicative predicate", according to Yu.O. Artemenko, is a unit of different structures functioning as a "predicate complicater" in the sentence [1, p. 1]. On the grammatical level it is a part of the compound modal verbal predicate, where the first constituent is a semantically bilateral construct. We agree that, on the one hand, it is an implicative indicator for the speaker [1, p. 5], but, on the other hand, we suggest, it is an indicator of the addressee's inferential meaning. The notion of "intention" introduced by S. Levinson (1983) is perfected as a pragmatic style that helps communicators to mutually understand each other [20]. Consequently, implicature may be considered as a universal linguistic phenomenon. If we can prove that inference of implicature exists in the text fragments chosen for the investigation, then we can assume its universal existence, see the author's latest publication [25]. There is a gap between the author's intended meaning and the reader's inference initiated by the scholars [8, p. 335–359]. The reader's ability to understand the author's intended meaning from his/her linguistic expression requires a certain investigator's approach to interpret a particular case in discourse. The approach suggested is based on the focus change in the complex predicate analysis, that is in all the preceding papers the predicate semantics was described as a unity, while we believe that pragmatic

semantics is concentrated in the first constituent that must be a pivot of the reader's inference description. Ahmet Mustafa, for instance, describes the hearer's ability to interpret a discourse written or spoken in the framework of pragmatics [24, p. 37].

Discussion. A pragmatic inference (also known as an inductive inference) is one which is likely to be true because of the state of the world. According to the Cognitive atlas inferences are made when a person (or machine) goes beyond available evidence to form a conclusion. On the contrary, we set an objective to prove the addressee's grounds. Unlike deductive inferences, pragmatic (inductive) inferences do yield conclusions that increase the semantic information over and above that found in the initial premises. J. Austin [2] made the first more concrete step towards the explanation of pragmatics impact on communication by introducing the concepts of speech act and of illocutionary force developed later by Searle. In the meantime H.P. Grice [11, p. 147–177] concentrated on describing the difference between “what is said” by the author and “what is meant” by the reader discussed in the works by P. Cole, J. Morgan, 1975 [9]. He realized that full understanding an utterance the interlocutors must share general knowledge of the world, contextual knowledge, knowledge of communicative principles. These principles can be described as common expectations in a given communicative situation between rational human beings. S. Levinson (1983) states that the notion of implicature provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what is literally expressed in the conventional sense of the linguistic expression uttered [20; 14, p. 515–521]. K. Bach and J.M. Saul reveal what components of the speaker's meaning are not components of what is implicated [5, p. 1–23; 27, p. 347–372]. We dare to express the following hypothesis “the grammatical meaning of the sentence with the given predicate is declarative – the constant value; the speaker's intended meaning is failure (fail): success (manage); the addressee's inferential meaning (try); and the pragmatic sentence meaning is perfective (can/could): imperfective (cannot/couldnot)”. We shall further concentrate our attention primarily on revealing and interpreting the addressee's meaning.

Investigation. The componential analysis reveals that lexemes that have a common range of meaning constitute a semantic domain – we may say that a semantic field or domain is a tool to categorise the world, see: the Whorf hypothesis [31, p. 25–37] or the theory of linguistic relativity, the notion that the diversity of linguistic structures affects how people perceive and think about the world has been a canonical topic of American linguistic anthropology. Such a domain is characterized by the distinctive components that differentiate individual lexemes in the domain from one another, and also by features shared by all the lexemes in the domain, for instance the lexeme *man-*

age shares a common component “*administer*” with lexemes *run, handle, rule, direct, conduct, command, govern, administer, oversee, supervise, preside over, superintend, organize, use, handle, govern, regulate*. Though if we select another component like “*succeed*” then the lexeme *manage* together with lexemes *cope, get on, carry on, get through, make out, perform, do, deal with, achieve, carry out, undertake, cope with, accomplish, contrive, finish off, bring about or off, control, guide, handle, master, dominate, manipulate* can organize another semantic domain. Likewise the component of the lexical meaning of the verb *fail* “inability” relates the following lexemes to one semantic domain: *fall flat, break, break down, conk (out), crash, cut out, die, decline, fade, weaken, deteriorate, dwindle, sicken, degenerate, give out, stall, collapse, crater, flame out, flop, flunk, fold, founder, miss, strike out, tank, wash out, collapse, neglect, desert*. And the component “*let down*” can be the dominant one of another domain: *disappoint, break one's promise to, dash someone's hopes, fall short of someone's expectations; neglect, desert, abandon, betray, be disloyal to, be unfaithful to, break faith with, flunk, screw up, wash out, underperform, not make the grade, not come up to scratch, underachieve, not come up to the mark*. Similarities in componential representations of different words determine their semantic relations to one another [23, p. 49]. In the 1930s, the structuralist notion of paradigmatic sense relations was applied to an approach called a lexical field theory. Based on research in historical semantics, J. Trier (1931) introduced the term “**lexical field**” (or semantic field) that he defined as a set of semantically related words whose meanings delimit each other [29, p. 417–427].

Evidently, the number of possible domains (*manage* – 6; *fail* – 9) depends on the number of common components in the lexical meaning shared by the given verbs. The question arises whether the verbs *manage* and *fail* are polysemantic words or they can be classified into separate units according to the differential features of the lexical meaning of each verb. They have been analyzed through this method in terms of a number of distinct elements or components of meaning. Names of J.J. Katz and J.A. Fodor are prominently associated with Componential Theory [17, p. 170–210] who tried to describe words in terms of relatively small sets of general elements of meaning which some are also called “Universals”.

The componential structure of the lexeme *fail* meaning is based on its definition registered in Oxford English Dictionary. First, we shall start with the etymological analysis of the lexeme *fail* to outline its semantic structure in dynamics development comes. It was borrowed from OF *faillir* “to be wanting”, “miss” Modern French *faillir* “to miss”, *falloir* impers. “to be wanting”, “to be necessary”, see: Portuguese *faillir, falhir*, Old Spanish *fallir* (in Modern Spanish replaced by the derivative form *fallecer*, Latin. type *fallescere*),

Catalonian, Old Portuguese *falir* (Modern Portuguese *falecer*), Italian *fallire* developed from vulgar Latin *fallire* (for classical Latin *fallere* “to deceive”), used absolutely in sense “to disappoint expectation”, “be wanting” or “defective”. The Old French verb was also adopted by Middle High German *vêlen* (Modern German “fehlen”), Dutch *feilen*, Old North *feila* (Etymological Dictionary). So the original Old English meaning of *fail* is “to be / become deficient or be absent or wanting”. In Middle English the meaning of “to be wanting / to complete a specified quantity” prevails, though a component “to fall short in performance or attainment” began to develop. In Early Modern English this meaning stabilized into “to be inadequate or insufficient”; now only of something necessary or desirable (coinciding with sense 5); often in present and past participle with noun or pronoun, as *failing this* “in default of this” (see: failing). Since its borrowing the lexeme *fail* has developed the following components due to its functioning in various distributions and discourse registers: *to fall off in respect of vigour or activity; to come short of obtaining or meeting with (an object desired), or of accomplishing or attaining (a purpose, etc.)* (1225); *to be at fault; to miss the mark, go astray, err* (1290); *to be abortive or unproductive* (1297); *not to render the due or expected service or aid; to be wanting at need* (1300); *to have a deficiency or want; to lack* (1306); *to be unsuccessful in an attempt or enterprise; to come short of performing one's duty or functions* (1340); *to be or become deficient; to prove deficient upon trial; to come short of; to miss, not to obtain* (1375); *to be wanting or deficient in (an essential quality or part)* (1389); *to leave undone, omit to perform, miss (some customary or expected action)* (1393); *to come to an end, expire of a period of time* (1399); *to become extinct; to die out, lose vitality, pass away (of odour, sound)* (1400); *to deceive, cheat* (1590); *to die* (1613); *to disappoint (expectation)* (1634); *to cease to speak of* (1650); *to become insolvent or bankrupt* (1682); *to fall ill* (1875); *to be unsuccessful in* (1884); *to fail safe: of a mechanical or electrical device or machine, aircraft, etc.* (1948; 1971). Componential approaches reduced complex meanings to a finite set of semantic “building blocks” [23, p. 49]. We can differentiate two nuclear components “to be wanting” and “to fall short in” which are able to form two microfields in the macrofield “failure”.

In the discourse typology based on the British National Corpus analysis the following distributional formulae of the lexeme *fail* can be revealed, e.g.:

- a) NP + VP (SOMETHING + FAIL + to + VERB);
- b) NP + VP (SOMEBODY + FAIL + to + VERB);
- c) NP + Neg + VP (SOMEBODY + NOT + FAIL + to + VERB).

H.P. Grice (and others) has offered an analysis of speaker-meaning and a reduction of sentential meaning to speaker-meaning [13, p. 213–223]. In the process of the content-analysis we shall try to differen-

tiate between the speaker's meaning with the help of the verbs *fail* in the preposition to Vinf and the recipient's meaning with the help of the verb *try* as a tool of semantic interpretation, e.g.:

1. Either no insulin is produced (Type 1 diabetes) or the muscle, liver, and fat cells fail to respond to insulin (Type 2). A3Y 130. → The muscle, liver and fat cells [try but] do not manage to respond to insulin.

2. Too many people fail to report crimes because they consider the police inefficient; we need to restore police efficiency in order to increase the reportage rate. CHL 82. → Too many people [tried and] did not manage to report.

3. When she did not come, he became angry, remembering the last time she had failed to arrive, on her wedding day. B7C 2153. → She [tried but] did not manage to arrive.

4. If an architecture fails to take over the mainstream computer market in its first ten years, it's not likely ever to do so. CTV 124. → An architecture [tries but] does not manage to take over the mainstream computer market.

5. Of course, some people fail to comprehend all four process aspects. B2F 1388. → Some people [do not try and] do not manage to comprehend.

6. This, of course, caught the attention of many journalists, and St Mary's did not fail to provide them with information. ARF 344. → St Mary's [tried and] managed to provide.

Thus we have decomposed the semantics of the predicate into (1) the sentence meaning: *declarative or fact*, (2) the speaker's (implicative) meaning: *failure/success*, (3) the recipient's (inferential) meaning: *trial*, and (4) pragmatic meaning “*perfective/imperfective action*” [14, p. 515–521; 15, p. 21–31; 28, p. 439–460]. Using the lexeme *fail* the speaker expresses his failure, and the hearer can point out whether the speaker *tried* or *did not*. The quantitative analysis of the *fail* used in the literary fragments in the British National Corpus reveals its high frequency: *failed/has failed/had failed* (9129); *fail* (3328); *failing* (2221); *fails* (1843).

In W. Somerset Maugham's discourse the predicate includes a Neg constituent to underline the imperfective aspect of the action in the following distributional formulae can be:

- a) NP + Neg + VP (SOMETHING + COULD + HARDLY/NEVER + FAIL + to + VERB);
- b) NP + Neg + VP (SOMETHING + NEVER/NOT + FAIL + to + VERB);
- c) NP + Neg + VP (SOMEBODY [NEVER] + FAILED + to + VERB).

7. I thought it could hardly have failed to strike them that there was something incongruous in him. (Ch. 15). → If it tried it could manage.

8. I smiled, for his appearance, so rotund and yet so startled, could never fail to excite a smile, and then as I came nearer I noticed that he seemed singularly

disconsolate. (Ch. 27). → It [tried and] managed to excite.

9. I have never failed to read the Literary Supplement of *The Times*. (Ch. 2). → I [tried and] managed to read.

The obligatory distribution of the lexeme *fail* is its combinability with the Vinf [7, p. 39–70]. Thus, in the context the recipient reveals two components in the lexeme semantic structure of *try* and *manage*. The speaker's intended meaning actualizes the sentence presupposition of success, see history of the point [1, p. 4–5; 21; 22, p. 371–388].

We consider the verbs *fail* and *manage* may constitute a pair of semantic conversive opposition – negative constituent: positive constituent. Therefore we can interpret *fail* as “negative manage”, and *manage* as “positive manage”.

The next part of our investigation will be focused on the semantics of the composite predicate expressed by the VP → Manage + Vinf in the declarative sentence. In order to intergrate the lexical meaning with the phrasal meaning J.J. Katz and J.A. Fodor introduced the notion of *projection rules* by which a semantic components of a lexeme “project up” the phrasal tree to give the meanings of phrases and, eventually the meaning of the sentence [17, p. 170–210]. Such approach helped us to reveal four types of the sentence meaning with the composite predicate under study.

According to the OED entry the original French verb lexeme *manage* was borrowed into Late Middle English with the meaning “handle”: recorded earlier than the cognate “manage” noun, and probably directly Italian *maneggiare* “to handle”, especially “to manage” or “train” (horses) = Spanish *manejar*, French *manier*: vulgar Latin type *manidiāre*, Latin *man-us* (Italian, Spanish *mano*, French *main*) “hand”. Although the etymological form *manege* appears in the earliest example, the ending was, as in *-n.*, already in the 16th c. assimilated to the common suffix *-age*. The form *menage* in early examples is taken from the noun; but in the late 17th and early 18th c. it was chiefly used where the sense closely approaches that of the French *ménager* “to use carefully, to husband, spare”, French *ménage household*. This French verb certainly influenced the sense-development of the English word: there are frequent instances of *manage* (as well as of *menage*) which can only be regarded as conscious Gallicisms (Oxford English Dictionary).

Words are used in context and a substantial part of the meaning is derived from the context in which it is used. Due to the lexeme *manage* use in various genres and distributions it began to develop or rather actualize the following components which are recorded in the texts: *direct* (1561), *conduct* (1579), *handle* (1586), *operate* (1591), *control* (1594), *govern* (1609), *work out* (1627), *succeed in accomplishing* (1638, 1722, 1854), *administer* (1649), *deal* (1649),

could (1655), *move* (1695), *bring somebody to consent* (1706), *take care of* (1715), *equip* (1720), *tackle* (1722, 1825), *organize, act as* (1928), *carry* (1997). Here you can see the dynamic semantics of the verb lexeme *manage* where the year of its record is defined.

All the referred components of the lexeme semantic structure in the language system are represented in discourse by their corresponding lexemes which can be classified into various lexical semantic fields or domains. S. Wyler (1992) makes a very subtle distinction: a lexical field is “a structure formed by lexemes” while a semantic field is “the underlying meaning which finds expression in lexemes” [33, p. 19–21]. The theory of the lexical field or word-field theory was initiated by J. Trier, 1931 in his research; the main idea is that words acquire their meaning through their relationships to other words within the same word field (“Bedeutungsfeld” or ein “Sinnbezirk”) – and extending the sense of one word narrows the meaning of neighboring words. The words which are part of a lexical field enter into sense or meaning relationships with one another [29, p. 417–427]. Each word delimits the meaning of the next word in the field and is delimited by it; that is, it marks off an area or range within the semantic domain. We believe that a redistribution of semantic components of the lexemes in the field occurs. Their semantic structures are verified in discourse wherein components undergo shift: nucleus → periphery and periphery → nucleus due to the author's intention, lexeme distribution, and discourse register. L. Wittgenstein expressed the idea that language must decide how to express an underlying concept so that it can be shared by both a speaker and a hearer [32, p. 5]. The concept “dealing” can be verbalized by the lexemes: “to deal with (something) usually skillfully or efficiently”: *to deal with (something) usually skillfully or efficiently, address, contend (with), cope (with), field, grapple (with), hack, manage, maneuver, manipulate, negotiate, play, swing, take, treat, engineer, finesse, jockey; bring off, carry off, carry out, get off, pull; command, direct, guide, steer; control, micromanage, regulate, run; react (to), respond (to)* which can organize the Lexical-semantic field “succeeding (dealing) successfully”. The term “semantic domain” or “semantic field” has always been closely linked to componential analysis. A semantic domain is defined by E. Nida as a group of meanings which share a number of semantic features or components [26, p. 174]. In linguistics a semantic domain is defined as a lexical set with related meanings, which form a conceptual network or mosaic, which can be analyzed in terms of componential analysis into distinctive features. A lexical semantic domain corresponds to what cognitive linguistics describes as a cognitive category. The minds of human beings tend to assign everything that is perceived in the world around us to categories.

Most of this categorization process happens automatically and unconsciously. Lexical semantic domains deal with the paradigmatic relations between a lexical item and other members of the same category. We consider the components “to deal with” and “to carry” to be dominant and are able to form two micro lexical-semantic fields within the macro lexical-semantic field of ‘management.

Further on we shall select the text fragments with the composite predicate which includes *manage* and combines with the infinitive. Look at the examples extracted from the text fragments (The British National Corpus) which mirror the following distributions:

a) NP1 + Neg + VP + NP2 (SOMEBODY + MANAGE + to VERB + SOMETHING);

b) NP1 + Emph + VP + NP2 (SOMEBODY + DO (emphatic) MANAGE + to VERB + SOMETHING);

c) NP1 + Mod + VP + NP2 (SOMEBODY + COULD + MANAGE + to VERB + SOMETHING).

10. Sometimes she even manages to go for a drink or meal with friends. ADR 1007. → She [tries and] does not fail to go for a drink.

11. Despite a few mechanical mishaps, loyal George manages to overcome the challenge and deliver the family to Rome. ABE 432. → George [tries and] does not fail to overcome the challenge.

12. None of the defendants cleared on appeal have managed to find new jobs in the City, and Mr Reed, who at 45 should be at the height of his career, says he has not tried. CBX 924. → None of the defendants [tried and] failed to find new jobs.

13. They never manage to engage the reader at any level except the cerebral. CAG 2114. → They [try and] fail to engage the reader.

14. During the early months of the season I catch my breath a bit, but the body is wonderfully adaptable and I do manage to reach parts of the loch others never cover. AS7 888. → I [try and] do not fail to reach.

The combination of Neg + Vmanage is interpreted by “fail” as coversives have a common semantic component “successful: unsuccessful event”. There is a sufficient number of cases illustrating interchangeability and interdependency of the conversives “fail: manage” in the discourse typology as well as the author’s discourse. The quantitative analysis of the use of the lexeme *manage* in the text fragments registered reveals its lower frequency: the *managed* (7320), *manage* (3958 + *could manage* (277)), *managing* (3411), *manages* (646) than that of *fail* in The British National Corpus. In the process of the content-analysis of the sentences with the composite predicate *manage* + Vinf we could differentiate between the speaker’s meaning with the help of the verbs *manage* and the recipient’s meaning with the help of the verb *try* as a tool of semantic interpretation.

A contextual semantic domain corresponds to what cognitive linguistics describes as a cognitive frame or cognitive context. Whereas lexical seman-

tic domains deal with the paradigmatic relations between a lexical item and other members of the same category, contextual semantic domains focus on the syntagmatic relationships between a lexical item and other lexical items used in the same context or cognitive frame. In W. Somerset Maugham’s discourse the lexeme *manage* occurs in the following distributions:

a) NP1 + VP + NP2 (SOMEBODY + MANAGE + to VERB + SOMETHING);

b) NP1 + VP + NP2 (SOMETHING + MANAGE + to VERB + SOMETHING).

15. She asked me what I had been doing with myself during the summer, and with this help I managed to make some conversation till tea was brought in. (Ch.8). → I [tried and] did not fail to make some conversation.

16. The experience of life shows that people are constantly doing things which must lead to disaster, and yet by some chance manage to evade the result of their folly. (Ch. 33). → People [try and] do not fail to evade.

17. Their life in its own way was an idyl, and it managed to achieve a singular beauty. (Ch. 23). → It [tried and] did not fail to achieve.

The concept “successful event” is expressed by the perfective *manage* representing the speaker’s intended meaning, the hearers’ referential meaning is represented by “*not fail*” because the speaker *tried*. Another problem with J. Katz’s approach and classical approach in general became clearer in the 1970s when a series of experiments showed that word meanings are not usually as precise as “necessary and sufficient conditions” make them out to be. Instead meanings are often imprecise and “context specific”. J. Katz and J. Fodor were also interested in such properties of “readings” as synonymy, analyticity, anomaly, and truth conditions, as well as the actual content of the “reading” [18, p. 170–210]. Word meanings may have fuzzy “boundaries”, meaning that a word denotation may be hard to specify exactly [23, p. 51].

Consequently, the hearer infers his/her “reading” of the phrase of the type *manage to achieve* when “the subject tried much and did not fail to operate”, that is imperfective *manage* or “could”, and *fail to cooperate* when “the subject tried much but did not manage”, that is imperfective *manage* or “could not”.

Research conclusions and perspectives. The hearer infers his/her “reading” of the phrase of the type *manage to operate* when “the subject tried much and did not fail to operate”, that is “could”, and *fail to cooperate* when “the subject tried much but did not manage”, that is “could not”. The composite (modal) predicate *manage/fail* + Vinf helps to differentiate four types of meaning: sentence meaning, speaker’s (intended) meaning: *manage/fail*, recipient’s (referential) meaning *try* and sentence pragmatic meaning (perfective “can/could”: non-imperfective “cannot/could not”). The grammatical meaning of the sen-

tence remains a constant value: declarative which can be differentiated in terms of J. Austin – J. Searle.

The given investigation cannot be complete without a contrastive analysis of the referred composite

predicates, for instance, in the English and the author's second language to prove the validity of the implicative verb notion and the suggested analysis of its meaning.

References

1. Артеменко Ю.О. Дієслівні індикатори імплікатур в англомовному дискурсі: структурно-семантичний та лінгвістичний та лінгвопрагматичний аспекти : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 / Ю.А. Артеменко. – Х., 2015. – 20 с.
2. Austin J.L. How to Do Things with Words / J.L. Austin. – 2nd ed. – Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1975. – 168 p.
3. Appel A.W. Predicate Implication and Subtyping / A.W. Appel et al. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 120 p.
4. Ariel M. Defining Pragmatics / M. Ariel. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 330 p.
5. Bent K. Meaning, Speech Acts, and Communication / K. Bent // Harnish R.M. Introduction to Part I. Basic Topics in the Philosophy of Language / R.M. Harnish (edr.). – New Jersey : Prentice-Hall, 1994. – P. 1–23.
6. Bach K. Saying, Meaning and Implicating / K. Bach // Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics / K. Bach and K.M. Jaszczolt (eds.). – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2012. – P. 47–68.
7. Bower C. The Typological Implications of Bardi Complex Predicates / C. Bower // Linguistic Typology. – 2010. – Vol. 14. – Issue 1. – P. 39–70.
8. Clark H.H. Semantics and comprehension / H.H. Clark // Current Trends in Linguistics / T.A. Sebeok (edr.). – Vol. 12. – The Hague : Mouton, 1974. – P. 335–359.
9. Cole P. Syntax and Semantics / P. Cole, J.L. Morgan (eds.). – Vol. 3 : Speech Acts. – New York : Academic Press, 1975. – 406 p.
10. Fries C. The Structure of English / C. Fries. – London : Lowe and Brydone, LTD, 1951. – 320 p.
11. Grice H.P. Utterer's Meaning and Intentions / H.P. Grice // The Philosophical Review. – 1969. – № 78. – P. 147–177.
12. Grice H.P. Logic and Conversation / H.P. Grice // Cole P. Syntax and Semantics / P. Cole, J.L. Morgan (eds.). – Vol. 3 : Speech Acts. – New York : Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41–58.
13. Grice H.P. Studies in the Way of Words / H.P. Grice. – Cambridge ; London : Harvard University Press, 1989. – Vol. 78. – Issue 2. – P. 213–223.
14. Haviland S.E. What's new? Acquiring New Information as a Process in Comprehension / S.E. Haviland, H.H. Clark (eds.) // Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior. – 1974. – Vol. 13. – P. 515–521.
15. Just M.A. Drawing Inferences from the Presuppositions and Implications of Affirmative and Negative Sentences / M.A. Just, H.H. Clark // Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior. – 1973. – Vol. 12. – P. 21–31.
16. Karttunen L. Implicative Verbs / L. Karttunen // Language. – 1971. – Vol. 47. – P. 340–358.
17. Katz J.J. The Structure of a Semantic Theory / J.J. Katz, J.A. Fodor // Language. – 1963. – Vol. 39. – № 2. – P. 170–210.
18. Lauer S. Towards a Dynamic Pragmatics / S. Lauer. – Stanford : Stanford University, 2013. – 309 p.
19. Leech G.N. Principles of Pragmatics / G.N. Leech. – London ; New York : Longman, 1983. – 257 p.
20. Levinson S.C. Pragmatics / S.C. Levinson. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 438 p.
21. McCawley J.D. Everything that Linguists Have Always Wanted to Know about Logic... But Were Ashamed to Ask / J.D. McCawley. – Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1993. – 633 p.
22. McCawley J.D. Presupposition and Discourse Structure / J.D. McCawley // Syntax and Semantics / D. Dinneen, Ch. Kyu Oh (eds.). – Vol. 2. – New York : Academic Press, 1979. – P. 371–388.
23. Murphy L.M. Lexical Meaning / L.M. Murphy. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2010. – 250 p.
24. Mustafa Ahmet Mustafa Shazali. The Interpretation of Implicature: A Comparative Study between Implicature in Linguistics and Journalism / Ahmet Mustafa Shazali Mustafa // Journal of Language Teaching and Research. – 2010. – Vol. 1. – № 1. – P. 35–43.
25. Mykhaylenko V.V. Inferential Semantics of Historical "Be-Perfect" / V.V. Mykhaylenko // Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія «Філологія». – 2015. – № 16. – С. 135–139.
26. Nida E.A. Componential Analysis of Meaning / E.A. Nida. – The Hague : Mouton, 1975. – 269 p.
27. Saul J.M. What is said and psychological reality: Grice's project and relevance theorists' criticisms / J.M. Saul // Linguistics and Philosophy. – 2002. – Issue 25. – P. 347–372.
28. Strawson P.F. Intention and convention in speech acts / P.F. Strawson // The Philosophical Review. – 1964. – Vol. 73. – Issue 4. – P. 439–460.
29. Trier J. Sprüche Felder / Jost Trier // Zeitschrift für Deutsche Bildung. – 1932. – Heft 8. – S. 417–427.
30. Vosniadou S. Drawing Inferences from Semantically Positive and Negative Implicative Predicates / S. Vosniadou // Journal of Psycholinguistic Research. – 1982. – Vol. 11. – № 1. – P. 77–93.
31. Whorf B.L. Language, Mind and Reality / B.L. Whorf // Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf / J.B. Carroll (ed.). – Cambridge : MIT Press, 1956. – P. 25–37.
32. Wittgenstein L. Remarks on Colour / L. Wittgenstein ; G.E.M. Anscombe (ed.) ; L.L. McAlister and M. Shattle (trans.). – Oxford : Basil Blackwood, 1977. – 63 p.
33. Wyler S. Colour and Language: Colour Terms in English / S. Wyler. – Tübingen : Gunter Narr Verlag, 1992. – 203 p.