WHAT IS NOT IN THE TEXT: TOWARDS THE PROBLEM OF IMPLICITNESS IN DRAMA

Anna ERLIKHMAN
International Humanitarian University, Ukraine
erlikhman.anna@gmail.com

Olga KULCHYTSKA
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian University, Ukraine
olga.kulchytska@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The functioning of the language as a system is characterized by the tendency of economizing language units, which influences the properties and the meaning of a language sign. In consequence, a contradiction can occur between the latter and its means of expression, causing the emergence of such notions as implicitness and explicitness. Today, Pragmatics most often highlights the existence of nonverbal meaning, which might not be limited only by language units. The meaning, therefore, can be broader and not covered exclusively by lexical units, thereby creating implicit information.

The category of concealed meaning has been studied since Antiquity, but the interest for this scientific problem only increased in the second half of the 21st century. Implicitness is studied from a language-systemic perspective. On a lexical level, the following problems have been analysed: the concealed components of meaning, the polarization of the semantic meaning of language units, the means of implicitness marking (Nevidomska 2012); on a morphological level – mechanisms of implicit economy in word forming nomination, implicit morphology (Megentesov 1980); in syntax – implicit predication, the implicit semantic structure of the sentence (Starikova 1974). In speech, the object of scientific research is the implicit level of the utterance (Allan 2014) and the interpretation of implicit meaning (Grundy 2008). The rise of Pragmatics initiated the research into the speech aspects of implicitness, namely the theories of speech acts, implicatures and indirect communication. The stylistic approach to a fiction text analysis revealed stylistic markers of implicitness. In its turn, the discursive trend enabled the study of implicitness in terms of pragmatic potential of fiction texts. In the light of the cognitive mode, a methodology for the reconstruction of the implicit space of texts and analysis of implicit text concepts has been devised (Molchanova 1980).

The present study is concerned with the discourse analysis of implicitness in drama texts of the 20th century, aiming to singling out the means of implicitness realization and uncovering the process underlying implicitness decoding. The

research objective lies in determining the linguistic means of implicitness and the peculiarities of their functioning in drama texts.

In order to meet the objective of the investigation, the following research goals have been formulated:

1) to define the terminological apparatus of implicitness;

2) to determine the main approaches to studying implicitness in modern linguistics;

3) to work out the procedure of decoding implicitness in drama;

4) to single out the means of implicitness realization (henceforth MIR);

5) to reveal semantic processes in realizing implicitness.

This approach will show how implicitness functions in drama in contrast to other literary genres.

2. Theoretical Preliminaries

Implicitness is an intrinsic language feature (Papi 2009: 139) that is possible due to human cognition. Intending and inferring the information are two cognitive processes which enable communication conditioned by the 'maximum information, minimal words' principle. The mind systematizes the information, simplifying and accelerating the informational process.

In linguistics, there are two main approaches to defining implicitness:

a) 'concealed' information of the utterance formed exclusively by the compression of utterance components. It is studied mostly as the device of "language economy". Stephen Levinson uses the term *minimization* and asserts that implicitness results under a certain condition: the less you say, the more you mean (Levinson 1987: 61). An economical way of expressing the meaning 'between lines' is based on associations, which makes the omission of components possible. An associative connection is enough to comprehend the whole utterance when some of its components are left out. Obviously, implicitness is generated by the reduction of utterance exponents, thus leading to the shortening of an utterance verbal level.

b) implicitness is studied from the perspective of meaning, being analysed as an additional nonverbal layer created by various means (Galliker & Weimer 2000: 54, Leckie-Tarry 1995: 132). The supporters of this approach suggest not focusing only on the reduction of utterance units. Implicitness is a meaning-level category, whose nature is not stipulated exclusively by syntagmatic compression. In this article, implicitness is viewed in this perspective (reduction is only one of potential implicitness sources along with other means).

Implicitness belongs to various dimensions (language, speech, text, discourse). It is mainly studied on three levels:

a) the semantic-syntactic level of the sentence. This approach is limited to the sentence, where implicit information is either coded in some syntactic constructions or, even compressed, is comprehensible from an explicit message layer;

b) the contextual level of a text extract. This concept relies on conceptual and contextual conditions of implicitness decoding;

c) the discursive level of a text, which allows the study of implicitness through textual measures.

The terminological apparatus of implicitness is still being developed, as implicitness is a complicated and multilevel phenomenon, which reflects the correlation of logical, psychological, philosophical, pragmatic and cognitive characteristics and embraces a wide range of linguistic features.

In Linguistics, terms like implicitness, implicature, implication, implicit meaning are often used interchangeably, as there isn't a distinct boundary between them. The reason for an unsettled usage of these terms is their confusion, on the one hand, and a rise of new ones (implicative links (Megentesov 1980: 2), implicate (Molchanova 1988: 38), etc.) on the other. In order to get a deeper insight into the nature of implicitness, they must be compared and divergences must be emphasized:

(i) the term *implication* was borrowed from Logics and its automatic transference to Linguistics caused vagueness for the differentiation between implicitness and implication. In Logics, implication means "a logical operation, which forms a conditional statement 'if p then q'" (Routledge Linguistics Encyclopedia 2010: 333). Though the term is not originally linguistic, it has been widely used in Linguistics synonymously with *implicitness* (Keener 2012: 46);

(ii) implicature – a new term which appeared in the 80s (Bach (1994), Davis (2007), Searle (1985)). A distinction between implicitness and implicature is rarely made (Grundy 2008: 92). G. P. Grice introduced a new notion specifically in order to differentiate it from implication (Grice 1994: 24). However, implicature has a narrower meaning – "nonverbal information, created in speech when one of the cooperative principles is violated; an implicit link between two explicitly unconnected utterances". Implicature isn't a contra-notion, but, quite the contrary, presents one of the domains of implicitness. These phenomena are in categorical dependence, hence, implicature is a form of implicitness, as well as implication;

(iii) by implicit meaning we understand, following D. Wunderlich (1980: 298), "the meaning which requires a broader context for its understanding". If it is grasped in a neutral context, it's explicit;

(iv) implicitness is a feature of language and speech which points out to indirect informational content, a nonverbal meaning layer, an ability of the text to contain indirectly realized information. Hence, we define implicitness as "an ability to contain concealed, indirect meaning".

The analysis of the relevant terms gives strong grounds to state that implicitness is a phenomenon which synthesizes all types of indirect meaning and implication; implicature as well as implicit meaning are manifestations of its realization. Formulating "disguised" meaning, we believe it is wrong to say "implicitness is …", "implicitness can be put as", because this phenomenon is only

a text feature, ability. Therefore, we are to use *implication*, *implicature* or *implicit meaning*.

A distinctive feature of a drama text is two-level communication: character ↔ character (inner level of communication), author ↔ reader/spectator (outer level of communication. As the purpose of this analysis is to study implicitness in dramatic discourse, we consider that best form for decoding implicitness in an outer level of communication (author – reader) is *implicit meaning* seen as *implicature*, since it is better suited for inner communication (personage – personage). Implicitness is an *a priori* characteristic of the text, predetermined by aesthetic features of the latter. In the words of Linell about implicit features of discursive meaning:

> This might lure us into thinking that they are somehow secondary or peripheral, some kind of 'surplus meaning' added to the basic explicit meanings of texts. However, this is not the case. On the contrary, I will argue that implicitness is the rule, not the exception, in discourse semantics' (Linell 2002: 47).

3. Methodology and Data

The study is based on 88 British and American plays (amounting altogether to 5112 pages) written in the 20th century. The collected texts belong to 55 writers: Eu. O'Neill, G. Kaufman, W. Saroyan, T. Williams, A. Miller, T. Stoppard, E. Sheldon, R. Harwood, et. The corpus of data used in the study comprises 1238 extracts marked by implicitness (henceforth EMI) – parts of the texts where the information of the meaning level exceeds the information of the content level. Two criteria enable the singling out of EMI: content and context measures. Hence, EMI can be represented by a stage direction, a cue or a supra-phrasal unit.

In order to analyse implicitness in the drama text, the study employs semantic text analysis (Polischuk 1992: 300, Frey, Botan & Kreps 1999: 23) as its methodological framework. This method approaches the text not from the perspective of its components, but focuses on the unity of text organization. The major interest is achieved not merely through syntactical and logical structure. One of the organization factors is a "semantic gap" which might distort the semantic unity of the plot, but the latter is not violated and its semantic unity is guaranteed by the author's intention and genre homogeneity. The paper follows this method assuming that implicitness is a semantic lacuna of the text; if decoded, it loses its peripheral function and occupies a dominant place in text coherence. Additionally, the analysis of the verbal layer of the text and its role in text coherence contributes to demonstrating a borderline status of implicitness – it is an explicit-implicit notion, as it is marked by lexical means.

Besides the above, the research also applies the following methods: *contextual analysis* enables the revealing of implicitness in different contexts; *componential analysis* is used for studying the lexical structure of a language unit and the hierarchy of semantic components in the context; *discourse analysis* gives

grounds for determining the illocutionary force of a communicative act relevant for implicitness decoding in the case of comparing implicit meaning in inner and outer communication; *quantitative analysis* contributes to identifying the frequency of MIR, EMI, and implicit meanings in drama texts.

The research suggests its own methodology of studying implicitness manifestation in drama. The implementation of this research is carried out in two directions: *genre – text – language*, i.e., from a general characteristic of drama texts to the analysis of its language level; *implicitness – MIR – implicit meaning*, i.e., starting with investigations into the functioning of implicitness in drama up to revealing implicit semantics. Due to these two directions, the research embraces genre, textual, lingual aspects.

The genre aspect is determined by the structure of drama texts and two-level communication. The textual aspect of implicitness analysis is connected with its realization in text fragments – EMI. These structures can be distinguished with the aid of semantic text and contextual analyses. The textual level contributes to: (i) sorting out EMI; (ii) implicitness interpretation and implicit meaning decoding in contexts employing the main text message, plotlines, character sketches which are integral parts of implicitness interpretation in outer communication. The realization of implicitness by linguistic means falls within the domain of the linguistic level.

The algorithm of the study consists of two stages. During the first stage, the authors searched manually for all EMI and means that marked implicitness in those fragments. The correlation between EMI and MIR is not stable, as one EMI can contain several MIRs. All these means were then classified into two groups (lexical-semantic, lexical-syntactic). This stage also draws on the peculiarities of implicitness realization by each of the means, focusing on phenomena underlying the process of implying the information. The second stage presents the process of decoding implicitness. It describes a step-by-step procedure, from spotting implicitness in the text to the classification of implicit meanings: decoding implicit meaning, analysing it with regard to outer communication, determining the type of implicit meaning. The structure of the analysis corresponds to these two stages respectively.

4. Analysis
4.1. Means of Implicitness Realization

The investigation into implicitness realization is conducted in a systematic-structural approach. The explicators are singled out and classified based on two aspects: (i) language-systematic – MIRs are classified according to the levels of the language system (though MIRs have been selected only on two levels: lexical and syntactic); (ii) text-compositional – MIRs are sorted out on the grounds of structural (outer communication) relevance of the text system. Two criteria were employed in the selection of MIRs: compliance with outer communication and frequency.

All MIRs perform three functions in drama texts:

1) the identification function – MIRs signal implicitness in EMI;

2) the marking function – MIRs accomplish implicitness;

3) the decoding function – MIRs are initial points for inferring implicitness.

The analysis of the corpus testifies that, in outer communication, implicitness is realized by:

1) *lexical-semantic MIRs* – elements of the lexical-semantic level which realize implicit information. Implicitness is usually marked by lexical-semantic means, as a word, incorporated in the text, becomes its constructive component and aesthetically significant element. Implicitness, realized by lexical means, is formed on the basis of contextualized word meanings. Implicitness on this level can be realized by components of the meaning (connotation), nomination motivation (inner form of the word), in-word semantic relations (polysemy), word-to-word paradigmatic relations (contextual synonyms and antonyms), secondary nomination (contextual euphemism):

a) *connotation.* Connotation conveys implicit meaning because: (i) emotive, expressive, evaluative components are embedded in the meaning; (ii) connotative meaning is 'secondary' and demands inference efforts. In texts, connotation depends on an aesthetic feature of their structure, which determines the semantic transformation of language units. Consequently, a latent meaning emerges, thereby creating a symbolic meaning. Connotation reflects the author's individual understanding and evaluation. In this paper, we approach connotation and its contextual peculiarities in terms of implicitness, since the latter can be different in micro- and macro-contexts. The main criterion for considering and singling out different contexts is the location of language units which evoke connotation and are relevant for its interpretation in the text (in the micro-context – within a larger-than-phrase unit, in macro-context – in the whole text). Let's consider example (1) (when a wealthy provincial brewer dies intestate, his siblings gather in the hope of dividing the estate. Although the offspring considered brewing to be non-aristocratic when the late was alive, they are praising him hypocritically):

(1)   James. Linchpool, <u>brewer</u>.
         Stephen. <u>"Gentleman"</u> is the more correct description. The business was converted into a company in nineteen-hundred-and-four.
         Louisa. <u>Gentleman</u>, ah! What a <u>gentlemanly</u> man he was!
         Ann. <u>A perfect gentleman</u> in every respect.
         Rose. <u>Most gentlemanlike</u>, poor dear thing

The connotation of *brewer* generates implicitness, since it is semantically opposed to the lexeme *gentleman*. The meaning of the latter contains an evaluative component ("a man from a high social class, especially one whose family owns a lot of property" (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English 2005: 672)). Their contrasting conveys an evaluative scale on which the language units implicitly present evaluative poles – "+" and "–" respectively. *Brewer* denotes a profession,

while the lexeme *gentleman* suggests class status. These divergences implicitly present the job of a brewer as work untypical of a higher social stratum and, in the micro-context, it acquires such connotative meanings as *of no prestige*, even *inferior* (implicit meaning – *Linchpool doesn't belong to aristocracy*).

b) *the inner form of a word.* Implicitness is regarded as the mechanism of meaning formation and that is why it belongs to issues regarding text nomination and, within its scope, the inner form of a word: "the closest etymological meaning of a word by means of which it acquires the possibility to actually mean the content that is put into it" (Daniels & Wertsch 1987: 29). For example: *an ice-cream* – inner form *ice* and *cream*; *an iron* – inner form *iron* (metal) as at that time irons were made only of iron (nowadays, the word has lost the characteristic which was the basis for its nomination as most irons aren't made of iron):

(2)   HARPER: They benn in th' bus'ness fo' goin' on twenty-five years now, Charlie.
        MR. CHARLIE: Infancy! Infancy! You heard this one, Bob? A child in its infancy
        don't have half as much fun as adults—in their <u>adultery</u>!

In example (2) (businessmen discuss the death of their colleague), the opposition between the inner form and the meaning is inherent to the lexeme *adultery* in the context. Being opposed to the word *infancy*, the inner form of the word can be presented as *adulthood*. But the context makes the meaning a starting point in decoding – the author implicitly states that the inclination for unfaithfulness is the feature intrinsic to adults. In the macro-context, this meaning is much deeper – Charlie, an experienced entrepreneur, implies that adultery is an indispensable part of business and could be the motive for the murder.

c) *polysemy.* In drama texts, the intentional manipulation of language units can be seen. As a result, the same lexeme expresses different components of the meaning on the explicit and implicit levels (3) (the owner of the shop selling sewing supplies is thinking about renaming it):

(3)   Dorothy: Also I'm going to change the name of the store. It isn't going to be
        "Simple <u>Notions</u>" any more; it's going to be "Tremendous Inspiration".

MIR is a hierarchical order of the meanings of the lexeme *notion*, whose definition is presented by two meanings: (i) "an idea, belief, or opinion"; (ii) "small things such as thread, buttons that are used for sewing" (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English 2005: 1122). This lexeme is used in the word combination *Simple Notion* – the name of the shop. On the explicit level, the second meaning is realized, i.e., the shop offering sewing accessories is denoted. Implicitly, the first meaning is realized due to the semantic connection with the lexeme *inspiration*. As a result, the key word combination acquires new interpretation *simple ideas*, which implies the woman's longing for new approaches and opinions.

d) *contextual synonyms and antonyms*. In a certain context, lexemes can actualize acquired integral (synonyms) or oppositional (antonyms) semantic components forming synonymic rows or antonymous pairs. Consider (4) (Vivien refuses to leave her husband for three years and thus create favourable conditions for writing a PhD paper):

(4)   GUENEVERE: Well, why don't you give him his three years?
       VIVIEN: Gwen! What do you think I am? An <u>altruist</u>? A <u>benefactor</u> of humanity? Well, I'm not, I'm a <u>woman</u>. Three years! I've given him three days, and threatened to marry a man back at home if he doesn't make up his mind before that.

The lexemes *altruist* and *benefactor* (lexical synonyms integrated by common meaning components – *kindness*, *helping others*) are in oppositional semantic relations to the lexeme *woman*. The latter acquires a new connotation in the context, implying that such a characteristic as sacrifice is not intrinsic to the weaker sex. The implicit meaning is that Vivien is not willing to give away her women's happiness for the sake of her husband's career.

e) *contextual euphemisms*. Example (5) (the children talk about their mother's absence) is devoid of euphemisms on the explicit level, but the macro-context (Ginevra's awareness of her mother's visit to her lover) enables to analyse the lexeme *theatre* as a euphemism. Her knowledge is confirmed by the utterance *that is what she said*. The lexeme *theatre* is a substitute for *betrayal*, which can be interpreted as a euphemism:

(5)   COSMO. That's all right. Father told you he had a message from mother saying that they had gone to the theatre.
       GINEVRA. But why?
       COSMO. Yes, it seemed to bother him, too.
       GINEVRA. The <u>theatre</u>. That is what she said.

2) *lexical-syntactic MIRs* – elements of the lexical-syntactic level which realize implicit information. The implicitness realized by lexical-syntactic means is related to such text categories as coherence and cohesion. Implicitness appears to be "a connection link", which provides for the semantic unity of the text, thus ensuring its adequate perception. The MIRs of the lexical-syntactic level generate implicitness between the distant EMI. Only two MIRs have been found in the corpus:

a) *sentence adverbials*. Despite syntactic and grammatical independence, an implicit semantic connection exists between a sentence adverbial and an utterance (6) (the couple's discussion about their servant's affair). The MIR is represented by the sentence adverbial *besides* with the aid of the retrospection link (semantic connection with EMI used earlier in the text) – Mrs. Baldwin's affair with the driver (*he* in the extract), thus realizing the implicit meaning – that Mr. Baldwin is aware of his wife's unfaithfulness:

(6)   BALDWIN – He is Gene's lover – or was <…> But that was long ago. (Mrs. Baldwin sighs as it relieved.) <u>Besides</u>, what have these servant intrigues to do with us? (Mrs. Baldwin tries to look indifferent.)

       b) *parenthesis* (7) (the character is expressing his dissatisfaction with his invitation having been declined):

(7)   MRS R. I understood you to say that the reason your father didn't come to dinner was that he had an urgent appointment, <u>quite unexpectedly</u>, at the last moment. <…> I wonder what the trouble has been <…>

       The parenthesis *quite unexpectedly* explicitly demonstrates the negative evaluative pole of the character's deeds. Although, it also performs the function of MIR due to the prospective semantic connection (EMI used later in the text – the character's divergence in views on ship construction).

       The previously analysed examples indicate considerable differences in the realization of implicitness by each MIR. Therefore, there is no unified way of realizing implicitness by means of all MIR, as each of them is characterized by their own algorithm and peculiarities (Table 1).

MIR	Peculiarities of realizing implicitness	Number of MIR	Number of EMI
connotation	implicitness is realized by connotations in micro- (supra-phrase unity) and macro-contexts (the whole text)	302	261
inner form of the word	implicitness is realized by the inner form of the neologism; opposition to the inner form of the word: meaning.	135	123
polysemy	implicitness is realized by a polysemous word in two ways: based on one contextually dominant meaning or on the opposition of two meanings.	117	117
contextual synonyms	implicitness is realized by: an integral semantic component which is presented in the semantic structure of the word and acquires integral status only in the context; an integral semantic component which is not included in the semantic structure of the word, but acquires integral status in the context.	128	128
contextual antonyms	implicitness is realized by an oppositional semantic component acquired in the context.	165	160
contextual euphemisms	implicitness is realized by the relations between a euphemism and a substitute.	176	176

sentence adverbial	implicitness is realized by the retrospective semantic relations (with earlier used EMI) in the macro-context.	158	134
parenthesis	implicitness is realized by retrospective (with earlier used EMI) and prospective (with earlier used EMI) semantic relations in the macro-context.	177	139

Table 1: Peculiarities of MIRs in Outer Communication and their Frequency in the Corpus

4.2. Implicit Meaning Decoding in Drama Texts

Implicit meaning is a correlation between the content and meaning level of the text (the meaning level must be broader than the content level). The procedure of decoding implicit meaning allows for the comparison of explicit and implicit meanings of each EMI. Two types of the semantic relations between the latter have been singled out in the research: the semantic relations of supplement (8) and contradiction (9). Examples:

(8)   SYLVIA <…> A <u>woman</u>'s paradise is always a <u>fool</u>'s paradise.

(9)   KAY: I am glad you did I know so much more about you now. And I can't tell you now much more I respect you for coming out or that <u>fine</u> and <u>sweet</u> … and <u>sound</u> …
        GIMPTY (his eyes drop to his withered limp): Let's not get started on that.

The key factor for identifying the type of semantic relation is the evaluative scale. In example (8) (Sylvia's reaction to the news about her husband's betrayal) MIRs are the contextual synonyms *woman* and *fool*. The lexeme *fool* forms a negative connotation of both meanings, which supplement each other; there is a semantic difference between the explicit (*a woman's paradise – a fool's paradise*) and implicit meanings (*a woman is happy when she is not aware of her husband's betrayals*), but they are placed at the same evaluative pole. In (9) (Kay expresses her dissatisfaction with her boyfriend's neighbourhood) explicit (*Kay likes Gimpy's Neighbourhood*) and implicit meanings (*Kay doesn't like Gimpy's neighbourhood*) can be estimated along the scale "positive" – "negative" respectively.

Implicit meaning can differ informatively, which requires its classification. Studying implicitness in dramatic discourse (not in the conversational one), we divide implicit meanings into three types:

1) character implicit meaning – the meaning containing the information about characters (examples (1) & (3)) (total number 785);

2) concept implicit meaning - the meaning concerning the main message of the text (example 2) (total number 384);

3) plot implicit meaning – the meaning describing a fact or event (example 6) (total number 400).

MIR	Plot implicit meaning	Character implicit meaning	Concept implicit meaning	Total number
connotation	63 (17%)	169 (46%)	136 (37%)	368 (100%)
inner form of the word	38 (21%)	98 (55%)	42 (24%)	178 (100%)
polysemy	—	45 (37%)	77 (63%)	122 (100%)
contextual synonyms	65 (51%)	63 (49%)	—	128 (100%)
contextual antonyms	76 (45%)	93 (55%)	—	169 (100%)
contextual euphemisms	65 (29%)	160 (71%)	—	225 (100%)
sentence adverbial	46 (27%)	68 (40%)	57 (33%)	171 (100%)
parenthesis	47 (23%)	89 (42%)	72 (35%)	208 (100%)

Table 2: The Number of Types of Implicit Meaning in the Corpus

As it can be observed in Table 3, not all MIRs produce all types of implicit meanings. What is surprising about the data is that polysemy doesn't realize plot implicit meaning, but the number of concept implicit meanings is the highest. This is probably explained by the fact that the juxtaposed semantic components of one lexeme often present the main conflict of the text. Only the character implicit meaning is generated by all MIRs and prevails over other types.

In outer communication, one MIR can form several implicit meanings, so that the quantitative number of MIRs outnumbers implicit meanings.

Type of MIR	Number of MIR	Number of implicit meanings
connotation	302	368
inner form of the word	135	178
polysemy	117	122
contextual synonyms	128	128
contextual antonyms	165	169
contextual euphemisms	176	225
sentence adverbial	158	171
parenthesis	177	208

Table 3: Quantitative Correlation Between MIRs and Implicit Meaning

Table 3 shows that the number of decoded implicit meanings exceeds the number of MIRs almost in all cases (except for contextual synonyms). The most

productive are the connotation and inner form of the word. The data suggests that implicit meanings can combine groups with different configurations of implicit meanings:

1) group 1: character implicit meaning + plot implicit meaning;

2) group 2: character implicit meaning + concept implicit meaning;

3) group 3: plot implicit meaning + concept implicit meaning;

4) group 4: concept implicit meaning + concept implicit meaning;

5) group 5: plot implicit meaning + character implicit meaning + concept implicit meaning.

The quantitative data (Table 4) indicates that there is a tangible difference between the groups. The highest frequency belongs to group 1 with a total number of 37, whereas the lowest frequency (almost non-existent) is seen in group 4. The results are conditioned by a low number of concept implicit meanings in the corpus.

MIR	Number of EMI with implicit meaning groups				
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
connotation	5	12	4	1	11
inner form of the word	8	5	7	—	1
polysemy	1	1	—	—	1
contextual synonyms	—	—	—	—	—
contextual antonyms	2	—	—	—	—
contextual euphemisms	12	8	—	—	3
sentence adverbial	1	3	1	—	1
parenthesis	9	5	—	—	1

Table 4: The Number of Implicit Meaning Groups in the Corpus

5 Conclusion

This study dealt with implicitness with the aim of investigating its means and realization in the outer communication of drama texts. Specifically, the focus was placed on what marks implicitness in drama, what semantic processes form the basis of implicitness functioning, how implicitness is interpreted in drama discourse in relation to its structure. Given the lack of research on outer communication of drama texts, we hope that this article bridges the gap in this field of Linguistics.

The main conclusion is that the information in the text is not limited by the content-level and resides implicitly. The outer communication perspective broadens the scope of implicitness and converts the naturalistic dialogue into a dramatic one, forcing the researcher to enhance and deepen implicitness analysis according to the author's intention level and to the symbolic, emotive, evaluative,

figurative, aesthetic values of the text. Being characterized by a non-verbal nature, we argue that implicitness is not deprived of verbal expression and can be marked in the text. The investigation of implicitness has revealed semantic processes underlying the formation and accomplishment of this phenomenon. Language units undergo certain modifications in their semantic structure, acquiring additional meanings. In outer communication, the most productive are lexical-semantic and lexical-syntactic means, which are characterized by different algorithms of implicitness realization. The cornerstone in decoding implicitness is context, which enables determining links with text fragments (clues to inferring implicit meaning), thus restoring text coherence on the meaning level. The manifestation of implicitness (implicit meaning) chosen in the study can vary informatively and structurally. It has been proved that the means of developing implicitness can function on different text levels, generating implicit meanings of different types.

Like all other studies, this one also faced some limitations. Implicitness is a non-lingual phenomenon, so the statement of decoding is rather subjective and might differ if performed by another scientist. The subjectivity is intensified by the literary analysis which is individual to some extent. The analysis has failed to establish common semantic characteristics for all implicitness means, focusing rather on each one separately. Furthermore, implicitness has only been interpreted within text boundaries, neglecting wider contexts (historical and the author's background).

REFERENCES

Allan, Keith, *Linguistic Meaning*, London and New York, Routledge, 2014. (Allan 2014)

Bach, Kent, "Conversational Implicature", in *Mind and Language*, vol. 9, pp. 124-162. (Back 1994)

Bezuhla, Lillia, *Verbalizatsiia implitsytnykh smysliv u nimetskomovnomu dialohichnomu dyskursi*, Kharkiv, KhNU im. V. N. Karazina, 2007. (Bezuhla 2007)

Daniels, H. and Wertsch, J. V. *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987. (Daniels & Wertsch 1987)

Davis, W., "How Normative is Implicature", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 39, pp. 1655-1672. (Davis 2007)

Frey, L., Botan, C., & Kreps, G., *Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods*, 2nd ed., Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1999. (Frey, Botan & Kreps 1999)

Galliker, M. and Weimer, D., "Context and Implicitness: Consequences for Traditional and Computer-Assisted Text Analysis", in *Formal Aspects of Context*, Dordrecht/Boston/London, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000, pp. 49-63. (Galliker & Weimer 2000)

Golianych, Maria, *Vnutrishnia forma slova i khudozhnii tekst*, Ivano-Frankivsk, Plai, 1997. (Golianych 1997)

Grice, Paul, *Studies in the Way of Words*, Cambridge (Mass.), L., Harvard University Press, 1991. (Grice 1991)

Grundy, Peter, *Doing Pragmatics*, London, Hodder Education, part of Hachette Livre UK, 2008. (Grundy 2008)

Keener, Frederick, *Implication, Readers' Resources, and Thomas Gray's Pindaric Odes*, Newark, University of Delaware Press, 2012. (Keener 2012)

Leckie-Tarry, Helen, *Language and Context: a Functional Linguistic Theory of Register*, London and New York, Pinter, 1995. (Leckie-Tarry 1995)

Levinson, Stephen, "Minimization and Conversational Inference", in *The Pragmatic Perspective*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1987, pp. 61-130. (Levinson 1987)

Linell, Per, "Perspectives, Implicitness and Recontextualization", in *Perspective and Perspectivation in Discourse,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2002, pp. 43-58. (Linell 2002)

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, Edinburg, Pearson Education Limited, 2005, 4th edition. Della Summers (dir.) (Academic Dictionary)

Lyons, John, *Linguistic Semantics: an Introduction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995. (Lyons 1995)

Megentesov, S., "Implikativnye svyazi kak sredstvo semanticheskoy organizatsii teksta", in *Lingvistika i metodika v vysshey shkole*, vol. 151, pp. 66-81. (Megenteson 1980)

Molchanova, G., *Semantika khudozhestvennogo teksta (implikativnye aspekty kommunikatsii)*, Tashkent, Izd-vo FAN Uzbekskoy SSR, 1988. (Molchanova 1988)

Nevidomska, Lillia, *Implitsytnist: movnosystemnyi aspect*, KHARKIV, Ranok-NT, 2012. (Nevidomska 2012)

Papi, M. B., "Implicitness", in *Key Notions for Pragmatics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009, pp. 139-163. (Papi 2009)

Polischuk, G., "Semantiko-stilisticheskiy analiz teksta", in *Razgovornaya rech v sisteme funktsionalnyih stiley sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyika: Grammatika*, Saratov, Izd-vo SGU, 1992, pp. 277-302. (Polischuk 1992)

Searle, John, *Expressing and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985. (Searle 1985)

Starikova, Elena, *Implitsitnaya predikativnost v sovremennom angliyskom yazyike*, Kyiv, Vischa shkola, 1974. (Starikova 1974)

The Routledge Linguistics Encyclopedia, London and New York, Routledge, 2010, 3rd edition, Kirsten Malmkjær (ed.) (Academic Dictionary)

Wunderlich, Dieter, "Methodological Remarks on Speech Act Theory", in *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*, Dordrecht, Reidel Publishing, pp. 291-312. (Wunderlich 1980)

ABSTRACT

This article examines implicitness, its realization and decoding by lexical-semantic means in fiction. The authors substantiate their claim that implicitness is an inherent language feature co-existing with explicitness. Establishing the perspective of a linguist-literary scholar, the authors provide a multi-level meaning presentation from literal to figurative and symbolic, based on discourse analysis. It is shown that much of the meaning can be concealed in the text and extend the limits of the latter. The analysis reveals that implicitness develops by lexical-semantic and lexical-syntactic means, through a diverse array of generative and interpretative devices.

Key words: implicitness, implicit meaning, drama text.

REZUMAT

Articolul de faţă analizează problema caracterului implicit, a modalităţilor de realizare a acestuia şi a decodificării sale, prin mijloace lexico-semantice, în textele de ficţiune. Autorii susţin că implicitul este o trăsătură lingvistică inerentă, ce coexistă cu caracterul explicit. Dintr-o perspectivă lingvistico-literară, autorii realizează o prezentare plurivalentă a semnificaţiei, de la cea literală la cea figurativă şi simbolică, pe baza tehnicilor analizei de discurs. Se demonstrează că o mare parte a semnificaţiei poate fi mascată în text şi poate extinde limitele acestuia. Analiza arată că un caracter implicit se creează prin mijloace lexico-semantice şi lexico-sintactice, printr-o gamă vastă de mecanisme de formare şi de interpretare.

Cuvinte-cheie: implicit, sens implicit, text dramatic.