

IMPLICATIVE STRUCTURES IN LITERARY DISCOURSE: INTERACTIONS OF LOGIC LANGUAGE AND PRAGMATICS**Sayliyeva Mokhinur Rakhmiddinovna**Teacher of English Literary Studies and Translation department,
Bukhara State University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan
m.r.saylieva@buxdu.uz**Abstract**

This article examines implicature as a multilayered semantic-pragmatic category underlying the formation of implicit meaning in literary texts. It proposes a three-level model distinguishing logical implication, linguistic implication and pragmatic implication, and argues that these levels correspond respectively to the system of thought, the system of language and the process of speech. Logical implication is treated, after Lyons and Horn, as a strict, context-independent relation between propositions; linguistic implication, after Levinson, as content encoded within the semantic potential of language units through grammatical markers, lexical presupposition and semantic valency; and pragmatic implication, after Grice, Levinson and Sperber and Wilson, as inferential meaning produced through the Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims in context.

Drawing on examples from Jane Austen and on Lotman's conception of the literary text as a secondary modelling system, the study demonstrates that in literary discourse implicature functions as a mechanism that activates the reader's interpretation: the author encodes meaning in subtext, and the reader recovers it through inference. The three-level model offers a systematic account of how implicit content is generated and provides a theoretical foundation for the study of the communicative-pragmatic mechanisms of connotation.

Keywords: implicature, implicit meaning, logical implication, linguistic implication, pragmatic implication, Cooperative Principle, inference, subtext, secondary modelling system.

Introduction

The problem of implicitness in language and speech has long attracted the attention of linguists, psychologists, logicians and philosophers because of its complex semantic structure and the diversity of the linguistic means that express it. Although the theoretical foundations of the phenomenon have been considered in the works of Arnold, Bondarko, Kubryakova, Skrebnev and Stepanov, no unified scientific conclusion has yet been reached regarding the essence of implication, the features of its representation in formal structures of thought, or the categories of implicitness existing within a particular language. This diversity of views demonstrates the multiplicity of theoretical approaches in the field and underlines the need for deeper research into implication and its linguistic expression.

For a long time implicitness was interpreted mainly as the intended meaning of an utterance, as a deficiency of semantic connection between sentence constituents, or as the indirect expression of word and situation features through stable language units. Implicature, by contrast, is additional content that is not openly expressed in the speaker's utterance but is recovered by the listener through logical inference grounded in the Cooperative Principle. It arises beyond the direct meaning of language units, through context, the speech situation and the interpretive activity of the listener. The aim of this article is to systematise the mechanisms by which implicative meaning is generated and to show how the resulting three-level model applies to literary discourse.

Theoretical Background

The term implication derives from the Latin verb *implicare*, "to implicate, to imply", and was first used in the logical systems of Aristotle and the Stoics; with the rise of pragmatics in the twentieth century it moved beyond purely logical content and acquired a linguo-semantic and communicative-pragmatic basis. In Uzbek explanatory dictionaries implication is glossed as indirect meaning, hidden content, or additional meaning understood through context, while terminological dictionaries define implicature, following Grice, as the hidden content intended by the speaker and grasped through the interpretation of what is transmitted in the speech act.

Within contemporary linguistics implication is one of the central concepts of logical semantics, pragmatics and discourse analysis. Its use can be divided into three principal strata: logical implication, linguistic implication and pragmatic implication. These three levels make it possible to distinguish, on a scientific basis, the inferences produced through the system of thought, the system of language and the process of speech. This article treats the three strata not as competing definitions but as complementary levels of a single phenomenon.

The Logical Level

Logical implication belongs to the ancient stratum of logic, with roots in Aristotelian syllogistic reasoning and in the analytic model later developed by Frege, Russell and Whitehead. It rests on the principle that the truth of A entails the truth of B: if the first judgement is true, the second must necessarily be true. The classic syllogism in which all human beings are mortal and Socrates is a human being entails that Socrates is mortal illustrates this relation, where A entails C because the truth of the first judgement conditionally requires the second.

Lyons defines logical implication as a strict logical relation between judgements that is independent of the structure of language, and Horn characterises it as a pure inferential model operating outside the semantic system. Logical implication therefore relies not on the form of language units but on the mechanisms of deductive reasoning; it is not bound to context and expresses an invariant relation between propositions. This independence from context distinguishes it fundamentally from the linguistic and pragmatic levels.

The Linguistic Level

Linguistic implication rests on the lexical-semantic, morphological and syntactic systems of language. At this level the implication arises through the internal structure of the language unit itself, so that the additional meaning is encoded within the word or phrase. Levinson describes this as the formal connection between a linguistic expression and its semantic consequence. A passage from Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, in which the narrator characterises Mr Bennet as so odd a mixture of quick parts, sarcastic humour, reserve and caprice that his wife could not understand him, nowhere states that the marriage was unhappy, yet the reader infers the absence of mutual understanding and emotional closeness from the description itself.

Linguistic implication is frequently produced through grammatical indicators such as tense, mood, voice and negation, through lexical presupposition, in which a word requires the prior existence of some state of affairs, and through semantic valency, in which the meaning of a verb signals the presence of participants not explicitly named. The adverb in an utterance reporting that someone came again, for instance, encodes without stating it the information that the person had come before. Lotman's account of the literary text as a secondary modelling system, in which hidden meanings, associative layers and intertextual links constitute natural forms of linguistic implication, situates this level within the literary text: the implicit content is present within the structure of the language system itself, independent of, or only partly dependent on, the speaker's intention.

The Pragmatic Level

Pragmatic implication is the most modern, complex and extensively studied form of implication. Its scientific basis is Grice's Cooperative Principle, according to which participants in conversation rely on four maxims quantity, quality, relation and manner whose flouting or exploitation generates hidden meaning, that is, implicature. When a speaker, asked whether he will attend, replies that he has a great deal of unfinished work, he does not state that he will not come, yet the pragmatic implication conveys exactly that.

Levinson describes pragmatic implicature as additional meaning that arises beyond what is literally said but is logically derived by the participants, and stresses that it follows not from the literal meaning of words but from the rational and cooperative nature of speech. He insists on a strict distinction between semantic and pragmatic meaning: the former is determined by the internal structure of the sentence, the latter is the result of the listener's inference, so that implicature is context-sensitive, cancellable and dependent on the speech situation. Sperber and Wilson, within Relevance Theory, interpret pragmatic implicature as inferential meaning produced through the cognitive mechanisms of the human mind, the listener drawing a conclusion from the given information rather than from the direct meaning of words.

Pragmatic implication is shaped by the conversational context, the communicative intention of the speaker, the social distance between interlocutors, cultural conventions, and prosodic and gestural cues. Karasik interprets discourse as an evaluatively saturated communicative phenomenon containing an implicit semantic background determined by the speaker's value system and ideological position, which he metaphorically calls the semantic temperature of discourse. Cultural convention is decisive here: in Uzbek communicative culture an utterance promising to think it over frequently conveys a polite refusal, a pragmatic implication bound to the norm of indirectness.

Implication in Literary Discourse

In the literary text the three levels do not operate in isolation but are layered upon one another. A character's external behaviour may appear to be described objectively, yet the selectivity of detail, the manner of depiction and the syntactic construction express the author's hidden evaluation, which is not handed to the reader ready-made but grasped through inference. Leech treats implicature as a pragmatic phenomenon performing evaluative and stylistic functions, through which the speaker expresses attitude and emotion indirectly; in the literary context, this study argues, implicature acquires a still broader functional significance, serving to convey the author's emotional position, to ensure the coherence of the discourse, and to produce an aesthetic effect on the reader.

Arnold emphasises that meaning in the literary text is not confined to the denotative layer but expands through connotative components that are emotional, evaluative and expressive, and that the reader's interpretation is decisive in their realisation. Uzbek scholars such as Safarov foreground the role of irony, in which a discrepancy between the external form of an utterance and its intended meaning must be recognised through the reader's linguistic and pragmatic competence. Implication, accordingly, must be interpreted not only as a pragmatic unit but also as a stylistic and discursive one.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that implicature is a multilayered and complex semantic-pragmatic category formed at the logical, linguistic and pragmatic levels, and that the three-level model offers a systematic explanation of the mechanisms by which implicative content is generated. Logical implication is a strict, context-independent relation between propositions; linguistic implication is encoded within the semantic potential of language units; and pragmatic

implication, dependent on the Cooperative Principle, context and the listener's interpretation, reveals the dynamic and context-sensitive nature of the phenomenon.

In literary discourse implicature is shaped by authorial intention, aesthetic purpose and subtext, and functions as a mechanism that activates the reader's interpretation. The three levels are complementary rather than mutually exclusive, and together they constitute a fundamental category of the language and speech system whose semantic, pragmatic and discursive foundations provide the theoretical basis for revealing the communicative-pragmatic mechanisms of connotation.

References:

1. Arnold, Irina V. *Stylistics of Modern English*. 2nd ed., Flinta–Nauka, 1990.
2. Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. Edited by Vivien Jones, Penguin Classics, 2003.
3. Bondarko, Aleksandr V. *Grammaticheskoe znachenie i smysl*. Nauka, 1978.
4. Frege, Gottlob. "Über Sinn und Bedeutung." *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, vol. 100, 1892, pp. 25–50.
5. Grice, H. Paul. "Logic and Conversation." *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, edited by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41–58.
6. Grice, H. Paul. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard UP, 1989.
7. Horn, Laurence R. *A Natural History of Negation*. U of Chicago P, 1989.
8. Karasik, Vladimir I. *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs*. Gnozis, 2004.
9. Leech, Geoffrey. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman, 1983.
10. Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge UP, 1983.
11. Lotman, Yuri M. *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta*. Iskusstvo, 1970.
12. Lyons, John. *Semantics*. Vol. 1, Cambridge UP, 1977.
13. Safarov, Shahriyor. *Pragmalingvistika*. O'zbekiston Milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2008.
14. Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed., Blackwell, 1995.