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Abstract: The given article is devoted to the study of comparison and their interpretation of pragmatic and semantic meaning. Meaning is one of the most controversial terms in the theory of language. And at first glance it seems that understanding this term does not cause any difficulties - it is freely used in teaching, interpretation and translation. As for the analysis of some kind of context or text, it is faced with the problem of various types, such as word-meaning and its lexical, grammatic, semantic, pragmatic and stylistic meanings.
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Introduction. The given dissertation is dedicated to the comparison of Pragmatic and Semantic meaning and the research of their interpretation. Meaning is one of the most controversial terms in the theory of language. And first sight the understanding of the term seems to present no difficulty at all - it is freely used in teaching, interpreting and translation. The scientific definition of meaning however just as the definition of some other basic linguistic terms, such as word, sentence, etc., has been the issue of interminable discussions. Since there is no universally accepted definition of meaning we shall confine ourselves to a brief survey of the problem as it is viewed in modern linguistics both in our country and elsewhere.

The aim of the article is to give profound analysis of all types of meaning.

According to the aim the following tasks are set:

- To analyze and describe Lexical meaning and its functions;
- To review and describe Semantic meaning;
- To study Pragmatic meaning;
- To analyze the meaning from a Stylistic point of view.

The analysis results of this article is in the fact that all the results of investigation can widely be used for the language learners. In this article we discussed the Lexical meaning and its subdivisions: denotative and emotional and Semantic meaning which includes denotational and connotational meanings, and which describe synonyms and antonyms. And discussing the meaning from a stylistic point of view we describe logical, emotive and nominal meanings. Semantic meaning is given through the pragmatic means as metaphor and metonymy which causes some linguistic phenomena.

Analysis literature on the topic. The successful interpretation of B's response depends on knowing the conventional meaning of take a rain check in American English. No conversational implicature is involved here. Compare this with a similar exchange which does not involve the use of an idiom. Grice, Paul H. Meaning. Philosophical Review 66. 2007. –P 377-88.


Charolles suggests that a reader may see a certain continuity of sense between parts of an
utterance and still fail to understand it fully (in as much as it is possible to understand any stretch of language 'fully'). Consider, for instance, the following stretch of language:

*I went to the cinema. The beer was good.*

This is a perfectly coherent, if decontextualized, piece of language. Charolles explains that anyone who hears or reads it will reach the following interpretation: the speaker says that s/he went to the cinema, that s/he drank beer at the cinema, and that the beer in question was good. Note that we naturally provide the necessary links to render the discourse coherent. There is nothing in the above utterance which tells us explicitly that the speaker drank the beer or that s/he did the cinema. Charolles calls this type of minimal coherence supplemental coherence. He suggests that there is another type of coherence, which he calls explanatory coherence, which not only establishes continuity of senses but, unlike supplemental coherence, also justifies it. The difference between supplemental interpretations and explanatory interpretations, Charolles suggests, is that the former never lead to the explication of a thematic continuity (they indicate that an element is repeated from one segment to another), whereas the latter justify this continuity (they lead to the manifestation of the reason why a certain thing is said supple mentally about an element).

One of the most important notions which have emerged in text studies in recent years is that of implicature- the question of how it is that we come to understand more than is actually said. Grice21 uses the term implicature to refer to what the speaker means or implies rather than what s/he literally says. Implicature is not to be confused with non-literal meaning, for instance with idiomatic meaning.

Idiomatic meaning is conventional and its interpretation depends on a good mastery of the linguistic system in question rather than on a successful interpretation of a particular speaker's intended or implied meaning in a given context. For instance, in the following exchange.

*A: Shall we go for a walk?*

*B: Could I take a rain check on that?*

How does A, or anyone observing the scene, know how to relate the utterance 'It's raining' - a mere comment on the weather - to the question of going for a walk? Why do we assume that 'It's raining' is meant as an answer to the above question? One answer which has already been suggested is that we do it in order to maintain the assumption of coherence. If we do accept it as an answer, how do we know how to interpret it? Does it mean 'No, we'd better not because it's raining', 'OK, but we'd better take an umbrella', or perhaps 'Yes - we both like walking in the rain'? Note also that the same utterance *It's raining* can mean something totally different in a different context:

*A: What is Jane up to these days? B: It's raining!*

Here, Speaker A would probably interpret B's comment on the weather as meaning something like 'I don't want to talk about this subject' or possibly, depending on B's tone of voice and facial expression, 'You're out of line – you shouldn't be asking me this question Grice suggests that a speaker can signal an implied meaning conventionally or non-conventionally. To signal an implied meaning conventionally, a speaker uses the textual resources which are conventionally understood to signal certain relationships between propositions. Conjunctions such as *therefore, because,* and *in spite of are* one such textual resource. Grammatical structure is another. For instance, in *It's money that they want* the grammatical structure itself conventionally presupposes what is expressed in the subordinate clause, in this case *they want something. But how does a speaker signal (or a hearer interpret) meaning which is not conventionally coded in the language? Before I proceed to give an account of Grice's answer to this question, I have to point out that Grice is not primarily concerned with written text. In fact, he does not only restrict his comments to spoken exchanges, he restricts them to a very small sub-set of these – namely question/answer sequences.
Grice suggests that discourse has certain important features: for instance, it is connected it has a purpose; and it is a co-operative effort. These features give rise to a general principle of communication, the Cooperative Principle, which participants are expected to observe:

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. Implied meaning which is not signal led congenitally derives from the Cooperative Principle and a number of maxims associated with it: Quantity, Quality, Relevance (Relation), and Manner: 1 Quantity

(a) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

(b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Implicatures are pragmatic inferences which allow to achieve something like Charolles explanatory coherence and aspects of meaning which are over and above the literal and conventional meaning of an utterance and they depend for their interpretation on a recognition of the Co-operative Principle and its maxims. Apart from observing the maxims, a language user can deliberately flout a maxim and in doing so produce what Grice calls a conversational implicature. For instance, if used as a genuine question the utterance *Do you know what time it is?* conveys the meaning 'I do not know the time; I wish to know the time'. Levinson calls this type of meaning a standard implicature. If the same utterance is used as a rhetorical question, in the right context and with appropriate intonation, it could convey a meaning such as 'You are very late'. This is what Grice would call a conversational implicature. It is achieved by flouting the maxim of Quality which demands sincerity. Conversational implicature can be conveyed by flouting any or several of the maxims. To use one of Grice's examples: imagine that a professor of philosophy is asked to supply a testimonial for a candidate for a philosophical job. S/he replies that the candidate's manners are impeccable and his/her handwriting is extremely legible. How does the addressee interpret this testimonial? Grice, Paul H. Meaning. *Philosophical Review* 66. 2007. –P 377-88.

Knowing that the professor in question is in a position to comment directly on the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the area of philosophy but apparently refuses to do so, s/he must still assume that the professor is observing the maxims, particularly the maxim of Relevance. According to Grice, what is implicated by the speaker 'would be what he might expect the hearer to suppose him to think in order to preserve the idea that the maxims are, after all, not being . Levinson, Stephen C. Pragmatic reduction of the binding conditions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics* 27. 1991. –P 107-61. The addressee therefore infers that the professor is implying something by his/her reply, in this case that the candidate is no good at philosophy.

In the conclusion one can find the results of investigation of the problem of meaning. In the list of literature one can find all the references.

This work is devoted to the problem of interrelation of lexical, semantic pragmatic and stylistic meanings. According to the aim to give profound analysis of all types of meaning the following tasks were fulfilled. Lexical meaning and its functions were analyzed and described;

- Semantic meaning were reviewed and described;
- Pragmatic meaning were studied;
- The meaning from a Stylistic point of view were analyze;
- The connection of meaning and Polysemy were analyzed.

And after the profound analysis and considerations we come to the conclusion that Lexical meaning and semantic meaning have subdivisions as: lexical meaning includes denotative and emotional meanings, and semantic meaning includes denotational, connotational meanings which analyze synonyms and antonyms.
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