

## GRICE'S COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE AND EMOJI INTERPRETATION

*Numanova Marjona Ilxomovna*

*Samarkand State University named after Sharof Rashidov*

*1st year master's student, Institute of Languages and*

*Culture of the Peoples of Central Asia*

**Abstract:** The article examines H.P. Grice's theory, centered on the principle of cooperation in linguistic communication. The author explores the hypothesis that language is essential for productive collaboration, drawing parallels with the "yo-he-ho" theory of language origin and the behaviorist "Use Theory of Meaning." Special focus is placed on identifying pragmatic universals through Gricean maxims (Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner). The study also compares Grice's framework with the Natural Semantic Metalanguage theory developed by A. Wierzbicka and C. Goddard.

**Keywords:** pragmatics, cooperative principle, H.P. Grice, Gricean maxims, speech communication, extralinguistic context, linguistic universals, semantics.

**Аннотация:** Статья посвящена анализу теории Грайса, в основе которой лежит принцип сотрудничества в речевом общении. Автор рассматривает гипотезу о языке как инструменте продуктивного взаимодействия, проводя параллели с теорией происхождения языка из коллективных усилий и бихевиористской теорией значения. Особое внимание уделяется поиску прагматических универсалий через максимы Грайса (качества, количества, отношения и способа). В работе проводится сопоставление подходов Грайса с теорией естественного семантического метаязыка А. Вежбицкой и К. Годдарда.

**Ключевые слова:** прагматика, принцип сотрудничества, Г.П. Грайс, максимы Грайса, речевая коммуникация, экстралингвистический контекст, универсалии, семантика.

**Annotatsiya:** Maqola nutqiy muloqotdagi hamkorlik tamoyiliga asoslangan G.P. Grays nazariyasi tahliliga bag'ishlangan. Muallif tilning samarali hamkorlik vositasi

ekanligi haqidagi gipotezani ko‘rib chiqadi, tilning kelib chiqishi va ma‘nodan foydalanishning bixevioristik nazariyalari bilan o‘xshashliklarni keltirib o‘tadi. Grays maksimalari (sifat, miqdor, aloqa va usul) orqali pragmatik universallarni aniqlashga alohida e‘tibor qaratiladi. Shuningdek, Grays yondashuvlari A. Vejbitskaya va K. Goddardning "Tabiiy semantik metalil" nazariyasi bilan qiyoslanadi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** pragmatika, hamkorlik tamoyili, H.P. Grays, Grays maksimalari, nutqiy muloqot, ekstralingvistik kontekst, universallar, semantika.

Herbert Paul Grice (1913-1988), an English philosopher, created a theory whose root principle is the idea of people collaborating in language communication. The hypothesis that we need language for productive cooperation is readily supported by our intuition and has many respectable "partner" theories similar to it from other areas of linguistics (Grice's theory belongs to the field of pragmatics of statements).

For example, one of the theories of the origin of the language suggests that the first meaningful sounds made by a person (sounds of speech) was a stream of "hums, grunts and groans" ("hums, grunts and groans"), made by the ancestors of people in the process of producing a certain collective physical effort. Later, according to this theory, such proto-"uh-oh, hoo!" developed into meaningful speech and allowed for complex interaction between participants in communication acts (Yule, 2010). Among semantic theories is the "Use Theory of Meaning," put forward by behavioral psychologists such as Skinner and linguists such as Bloomfield, which says that the meaning of a statement (and a separate lexeme) exists only in a specific situational context (Reimer, 2010). Linguists studying the field of pragmatics of speech are looking for the meaning of a statement in an extralinguistic context, that is, in the features of a specific situation for the use of a statement. Finally, the Grice maxims that will be discussed (maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relevance and Manners) seem to me an attempt to find some universals in the field of pragmatics of utterance, somewhat similar to the attempts of Wierzbicka and Goddard to find universal "atoms of meaning" uniform for all languages set out in their theory of

Natural Semantic Metalanguage (Wierzbicka and Goddard, Natural Semantic Metalanguage Theory) (Reimer, 2010).

Grice's theory states that real verbal communication is carried out in certain directions, they structure our statements and encode, and decode the meanings enclosed in them in a special way. Grice uses the term "cooperation" to convey the main purpose of these guides. This word immediately gives rise to an association - "well-coordinated teamwork," it even sounds like overtone a kind of "altruism."

There is no doubt that people interact with each other through speech. However, whether the main motive for this interaction is the desire for "cooperation" in the sense of "honest," "fair" or even "altruistic" cooperation is a big question.

Grice's "Gold Standard" suggests that in our speech we must be truthful (not to say untruths, not to assert what we do not know - the maxim of the Quality of the statement); speak on the merits (give the amount of information that is in demand - no more and no less, maximum quantity); give only information "on the case" (maximum Relevance); clearly and clearly formulate the thought (maxim Manera) (Fromkin, 2010) These maxims sound somewhat like "covenants." The question that immediately arises: is there someone among us who is able to fulfill these four covenants in his speech?

For the maxim of Quality, the old, like the world, question immediately arises: "What is truth?" Is my truth true for another? As for the maxim of Quantity, I can only assume how much information my listener needs on this issue, with all my desire, I will never be able to accurately "get" into the required amount of information, and I will always give more or less of it than the interlocutor needs. With the maxim of Relevance, it is also not clear: even if I decide to completely deny myself, can I know exactly all the nuances of what exactly is important to the interlocutor in the subject under discussion? (an acquaintance told me how terribly offended by the insensitivity of her fan, who avoided talking at the very moment when she decided to open her feelings to him. After they married, he told her that on the day she decided to open up to him, he was tormented by an upset stomach, and it was at the decisive moment of recognition that he urgently needed to leave). Maxim Manera: it is well known that by psychological type people are divided into

"readers" and "writers." It can be difficult for "readers" to improvise coherent speech to varying degrees.

It looks like people do not just violate this or that Grice maxim from time to time in a conscious desire to create an implicature (to put the meaning into the statement that is not said, but implied) - but people do it all the time, always, simply because they are people.

However, Grice does not say that maxims must certainly be respected, - the principle of cooperation prevails, - in the desire for cooperation, people constantly distort and violate maxims, creating implicatures.

Maxims of Grice, therefore, appear to be some ideal models of speech expression that have the same relation to real statements as the meaning of a word in the mental lexicon (sense) to the meaning of a word spoken (meaning). Maxims, it turns out, are, as it were, our internal "good intentions," and real statements, somewhat exaggerating, "the road to hell." We do not "cooperate" with language, but rather use it as a weapon in the fight against others. We "conquer" the world with language, or, in any case, we "tame" and "train" with it our neighbor so that he leans towards our Quality (our truth), towards our unique Quantity, Relevance and Manner. These terms lose the meaning of the "gold standard" in a specific speech situation.

Intentionality of language is related to the problem under discussion (intentionality as a descriptive, meaningful nature of language -... "aboutness or contentful nature of language. (Reimer, 2010, p.33)). When we say a statement, we describe the state of the world corresponding to our sense of peace. But this statement is not a "topic for discussion" - our statements and how we violate Grice's maxims in them (consciously or unconsciously) are our projections of the world, our preferred scenarios of the world, its present and future states that are important to us.

Of course, it is a pity to destroy the pleasant thought of Grice's "testaments" as an unattainable, but ideal, to which lively speech should strive. Grice's "covenants" should, by necessity, be violated in real speech everywhere and always, and the main art of "speaking" is the manipulation of the principle of cooperation.

That is why, in real speech, there is a difficulty in defining the concept of "lie." Is there any partial violation of the maxim of Quality - a lie? If I tell a dear person that he is sick and say nothing more, although the doctor informed me about the hopelessness of the case - is that a lie? I deliberately hold some of the information that is important to the listener, thereby creating an implicature, communicating the possibility that he will recover. Technically, this is a lie, but we are talking about "lies for good." As Grice points out, the principle of cooperation is higher than the need (opportunity) to observe maxims. I also, according to the principle of cooperation, deliberately "lie for the good" when I show politeness, allowing the interlocutor to keep his (according to the theory of politeness, the theory of politeness) positive or negative face.

From the very meaning of the name of the principle - the "principle of cooperation" - it follows that the above examples are the area of permissible distortion of maxims in the name of a certain goal of cooperation, and they form the backbone of such distortions. Cases of deliberate selfish "lies" are cases of "transgression," "forbidden" moves.

But the problem, in my opinion, is that the above cases of "lies for good" are, in fact, the same cases of "imposing" the preferred scenario of the world of the speaker on the listener. Our "I," our "own" unique world is structured like an onion, it has many layers. The less threat we feel to ourselves in the act of speech communication, the more "sincerely" we will manipulate the maxims for the purpose of "cooperation," that is, it will seem to us that we are "time for the benefit of the other," "stimulate constructive interaction," "build synergies," but in fact this cooperation will be concluded, at best, in search of the most favorable for the speaker (to the detriment of the listener) compromise. The more we risk losing our selves in the act of speech communication, the more we will be self-serving - and, depending on the degree of flexibility of our psyche, consciously - breaking maxims.

As a conclusion, we can say that in live speech there is no fundamental difference between different ethical modes of distortion of maxims, and that the "lie" in pragmatics (not in the linguistic and not in the logical sense, however) is just another name for "speech," "speaking" in a real situation. It is interesting to note that the most

straightforward and "malicious" way to impose your "Quantity," "Quality," "Relevance" and "Manner" on others is the author's living speech in writing in the context of himself - literature.

If we approach the maxims of Grice in the above way, that is, as mental imperatives, always destroyed by the real context of the speech act, we can understand the essence of the phenomenon of dispute, differences of opinion. Disagreement with the interlocutor is the flip side of lies. Lying lulls the vigilance of the interlocutor, as if agreeing with him, it violates the maxim of Quality in the name of "cooperation." The statement of disagreement and dispute adheres to the maxim of Quality, but interferes with cooperation. Disagreement with the interlocutor is expressed by us if the degree of threat to our "I" in the act of communication is small. In such cases, we fervently defend "the truth." Lying and arguing about truth are thus two sides of the same coin. With this coin, we buy recognition of our "I" by society and the growth of our influence on others.

#### Used literatures:

1. **Grice, H. P.** (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press. (Главный труд Грайса, где изложены максимы).
2. **Grice, H. P.** (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3, Speech Acts*, pp. 41–58. Academic Press.
3. **Levinson, S. C.** (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. (Базовый учебник по прагматике).
4. **Wierzbicka, A.** (1996). *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford University Press. (Теория универсальных «атомов значения»).
5. **Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A.** (2002). *Meaning and Universal Grammar: Theory and Empirical Findings*. John Benjamins Publishing.
6. **Yule, G.** (2010). *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Источник по происхождению языка и "yo-he-ho" теории).
7. **Skinner, B. F.** (1957). *Verbal Behavior*. Copley Publishing Group. (Бихевиористский подход к языку).

8. **Арутюнова, Н. Д.** (1981). *Лингвистические проблемы прагматики.* (Фундаментальная работа по прагматике на русском языке).
9. **Падучева, Е. В.** (1985). *Высказывание и его соотнесенность с действительностью.* Наука.
10. **Safarov, Sh.** (2008). *Pragmalingvistika.* O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi. (Основной учебник по прагматике на узбекском языке).
11. **Mahmudov, N.** (2012). *Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llari.* Toshkent. (Об универсалиях и семантике в узбекском языкознании)