

# Implicature Among Related Semantic Phenomena

---

**Gulrukh Eshankulova Turakulovna<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> course Doctoral student of the Department of English Literature and Translation Studies at Bukhara State University

E-mail: [eshonkulovagulrux@mail.ru](mailto:eshonkulovagulrux@mail.ru)

---

## **Abstract:**

The study of subtextual phenomena is crucial in modern linguistics for understanding implicit meaning in literary discourse. While implicature, presupposition, and implication have been individually explored, their comparative semantic features within literary text analysis remain insufficiently studied. There is a lack of integrated theoretical frameworks explaining how implicature differs from other implicit meaning types in literary interpretation. This article aims to analyze implicature among related semantic phenomena such as implication and presupposition, clarifying their roles in decoding hidden meanings within texts. The study finds that implicatures convey non-literal meanings requiring inference from context and background knowledge, while presuppositions are propositional assumptions perceived as self-evident by both producer and recipient. Implication operates as a logical connection represented in microcontexts but is distinct from meaning itself. The research offers a theoretical synthesis differentiating these semantic categories, emphasizing that implicatures are generated during speech acts rather than existing as background propositions. This analysis contributes to linguistic semantics by enhancing interpretive strategies for subtextual reading and informing future research on decoding implicit structures in literature, thereby deepening understanding of semantic multilayeredness in literary texts.

**Keywords:** subtextual information, implicature, implicit meaning, encoding of information.

## **Introduction**

The problem of meaning is the object of consideration not only for linguistics but also for logic, philosophy, and psychology (see the works of G. Frege, A.F. Losev, L. Wittgenstein, R.I. Pavplenis, Yu.D. Apresyan, V.G. Gak, and others)[1].

Yu.M. Lotman, interpreting the language of art as an artistic code, speaks about the necessity of its decoding by the addressee: “The text appears before us as two times (at least) encrypted; the first encryption is a system of natural language (let's say, Russian) <...>. However, this same text - the recipient of the information knows this - is encrypted in another way. The conditions of aesthetic functioning of a text include prior knowledge of this double encryption and ignorance (more precisely, incomplete knowledge) of the adopted “secondary code” . The decipherment of the secondary code, according to Yu.M. Lotman, is marked by the explication of a meaning not expressed verbally. The phenomenon of the deep meaning of a literary text has a conceptual basis in the theory of R. Barthes, who believes that the existence of additional meanings in a literary text is directly dependent on the structure of the work itself[2].

The interpretation of literary texts is determined by the ultimate goal, marked by the understanding of the work. Since the process of understanding a text is explicated by establishing its meaning, it should be noted that knowing the content of a literary text does not yet lead to its understanding. Therefore, if the lower level of understanding is considered to be content as a “preface to meaning”, its conceptual basis is meanings that “are not contained in the statement itself and require additional interpretative efforts from the addressee” [3].

## Methods

The subtext phenomenon has long attracted the attention of researchers in various fields, however, it has not yet had a general theoretical understanding. Attention to semantic, syntactic, and especially pragmatic aspects of semiotics serves as the main basis for considering subtextual information and actualizes the possibility of interpreting text's constant features for the purpose of researching implicit meaning. In this regard, text analysis objectifies the study of it not as a closed, static structure, but as a moving, changing, forming new meanings[4].

The increased interest in questions of secondary, multiple meanings of the artistic text today allows us to reveal its hidden depths, secondary meanings, to form a constructive direction for interpreting the artistic text, taking into account the subtext as a fundamental dominant in its semantic structure, to focus attention on the possibilities of a new, semantic, according to E. Benveniste, signifying facts at the level of secondary nomination. Understanding the semantic space of a text is based on its substantive and procedural aspects, which underlie hermeneutic activity [5].

Information encoded in a statement with the help of linguistic means can be expressed explicitly (with the help of linguistic means) and is perceived by the recipient both implicitly (encoded only indirectly with the help of linguistic means) and implicitly (encoded only indirectly with the help of linguistic means)[6].

Using implicit information to influence the addressee is marked by the following postulates: 1. Implicit information, as a rule, is not perceived by the addressee, it acts without taking into account the analytical procedures for processing information; 2. The addressee independently extracts this information during the interpretation process of the text, and does not receive it in a ready-made form[7].

In A.V. Bopdarko's theory, implicitness is differentiated into systemic linguistic and speech implicitness. System-linguistic implicitness is understood as a type of implicit information that assumes the specifics of the system of meanings of a given language that actualize the mental and emotional component of the subject's life (the interrelation of the explicit and implicit components of knowledge). This type of implicitness is objectified by the categories of grammatical semantics: aspectuality, temporality, modality, personality, locativity, etc. A.V. Bondarko defines meaning as “the content of units, classes, and categories of a given language. This content is included in the language system and reflects its characteristics”[8].

## Results and Discussion

Situational implicitness (speech) “assumes that the meaning arising from the speech situation and corresponding to the situational information in its connections with the meanings expressed in this utterance by linguistic means is conveyed”. Speech implicitness is related to the concept of

implicit meaning. “The components of the speech meaning conveyed by the speaker (writer) and perceived by the addressee are:

1. the linguistic content of the statement (whole text);
2. contextual information;
3. situational information;
4. encyclopedic information (“background knowledge”);
5. pragmatic elements of discourse. These components of the transmitted/perceived meaning are essential for analyzing the EKS/IMP ratio”[9].

The implicit meaning is assimilated at the level of automatism, while the explicit meaning is projected onto the communicant's contextual knowledge, meaning it is subject to conscious control. At the same time, hints in speech, double meaning, bring to the forefront implicit speech phenomena, such as implicatures in T.P. Grays' theory, which complement A.V. Bopdarko's theory of implicit meaning and explicit meaning (conventional implicatures and communicative implicatures according to G.P. Grays, which will be discussed below)[10].

In linguistic semantics, several types of implicit information in a statement are distinguished, among which implications, presuppositions, subtext, implicatures, and others are most significant. The term “implication” is taken from logic and is manifested as a logical operation representing statements united by a logical connection corresponding to the conjunction “if.., then...” and represented in the form of the formula  $A - *B$ . The textual interpretation of this phenomenon represents the content of both terms or one. The second case involves the presence of implicature in the text (this phenomenon will be discussed later)[11].

The concept of “implication” was the subject of research by I.V. Arnold, who received the following interpretation: an additional implied meaning arising from the relationship of the adjacent units of the text, but not verbally expressed by them [6]. Text implication, in her opinion, is realized in a microcontext, the boundaries of which are defined by its referent - the situation depicted in the text. It requires the connection of extralinguistic context, background knowledge of the addressee. The researcher also emphasizes the situational nature of implication, the presence of which distinguishes it from the subtext realized in the macrocontext of the entire work[12].

Thus, textual implication is congruent with the notion of implicit content or meaning, which, in our view, is fundamentally incorrect. Implication cannot be identical to meaning, because the meaning of the text, presented as a collection of various connections and relationships, is a construction, a result of reflection on the substantive form, the style of the text[13].

Another concept related to the type of implicit information and preceding the statement, determining the conditions for its appropriateness, is presupposition. The concept of presupposition was introduced into philosophical logic by P. Strosson and is defined as the set of propositional attitudes of the speaker before the process of expressing a thought. A proposition is a presupposition if the producer considers its truth to be self-evident and proceeds from the fact that other participants in the context hold the same viewpoint. The set of presuppositions is objectified by the phrases that the producer formulates. The method of differentiating presuppositions and implicatures serves as the precedence of presuppositions to the speech act, while implicatures are born during the speech act, they are not a propositional background present in the producer's representation[14].

Because the presupposition relation arises automatically in consciousness and is often not perceived by the recipient, it can be quite difficult to question or refute the presupposition. Presupposition is used for so-called “packaging” of doubtful information, which is unconsciously perceived as necessary. For followership and presupposition to arise in the consciousness of the text perceiver, it is necessary to have a certain amount of background extralinguistic knowledge with which the explicit meaning of the statement can be correlated. At the same time, following the pragmatic view, “presupposition is a propositional statement, not a semantic relation. Presuppositions in this understanding are more common in people than in propositions or sentences” . In other words, semantic presupposition arises from the very meaning of the statement, is the

general cultural background of the subjects of communication, and manifests itself as a type of semantic consequence, the main characteristic of which is fearlessness (lack of context influence) and conventionality (fixation to language units outside their actualization)[15].

### Conclusion

Implicatures represent such units of implicit information that are not dependent on the conventional structure of linguistic expressions and are oriented towards describing non-literal meanings. Implications, unlike presuppositions, require mandatory inference based on background knowledge and the general context of the communicative situation.

In conclusion, this study has shown that implicature, as a type of implicit meaning, plays a crucial role in uncovering hidden semantic layers within literary texts. Unlike presuppositions, implicatures require active inference from the reader, integrating background knowledge and context to derive meaning. This highlights that understanding literary texts demands more than decoding their explicit content; it involves interpreting deeper structures and indirect meanings embedded within discourse. The analysis confirms that implicature contributes significantly to the richness, expressiveness, and interpretative depth of texts, underlining its relevance for linguistic, literary, and pragmatic studies focusing on semantic multiplicity and subtextual information.

### References

- [1] U. Eco, *A Theory of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press, 1976.
- [2] R. Jakobson, *Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics*. MIT Press, 1960.
- [3] M. A. K. Halliday и R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English*. Longman, 1976.
- [4] C. S. Peirce, *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Harvard University Press, 1931.
- [5] J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press, 1962.
- [6] V. V. Dementiev, *Indirect Communication*. Gnosis, Moscow, 2006.
- [7] K. A. Dolinine, «Linguistic-Semiotic Foundations of the Interpretation of Prose Literary Texts (French Language)», Doctor of Philological Sciences Dissertation, Leningrad, 1988.
- [8] S. C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- [9] R. S. Stalnaker, «Pragmatics», в *New in Foreign Linguistics, Issue XVI*, Moscow, 1983, cc. 419–438.
- [10] G. N. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman, 1983.
- [11] R. Barthes, *Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics*. Progress, Moscow, 1989.
- [12] J. R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- [13] O. P. Vorobyeva, *Text Categories and the Factor of the Addressee*. Vyshcha Shkola, Kyiv, 1993.
- [14] Y. M. Lotman, *The Structure of Artistic Text*. Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1970.
- [15] G. I. Bohin, *Typology of Text Understanding*. KSU, Kalinin, 1986.