"IMPLICITNESS" (HIDDEN MEANING) AND ITS PRAGMATIC FEATURES IN FORMAL COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Kaypanova Raushan Joldasbay qızı
1st-year Master's student
in Linguistics (English Language)
at Tashkent University of Humanities

Abstract. *This thesis provides a comparative pragmatic account of implicitness in formal communication in English and Uzbek. It aims to identify how hidden meaning is generated and interpreted through presupposition and implicature under institutional constraints. The study applies pragmatic analysis and discourse-oriented comparison to representative formal genres. The novelty lies in systematizing language-specific implicitness strategies within formality norms and explaining interpretation risks that affect clarity, politeness, and legal-administrative precision.*

Keywords. *implicitness; pragmatics; presupposition; conversational implicature; formal discourse; politeness strategies; institutional communication*

Formal communication is a standardized, accountable, and often documentary domain of language. In such conditions, meaning is expected to be expressed openly and clearly, but practice shows that implicitness is always present in official English and Uzbek speech: it stems from socio-pragmatic needs such as economy of speech, caution, diplomatic tone, addressed respect, as well as the distribution of ambiguous responsibilities. Understanding

implicitness as "unspoken but understood meaning" provides only a general definition; in scientific analysis, it is viewed in connection with mechanisms such as presupposition, implicature, ellipsis, euphemism, modal means, nominalization, and institutional formulas. Therefore, in this thesis, implicitness is interpreted not as a "hidden semantic layer" of formal discourse, but as a pragmatic process that starts between the participants of communication through common knowledge, status, protocol and genre requirements [1; 4].

From the perspective of pragmatic theory, the most productive field of implicitness is implicature. Gray's principle and maxims of cooperation are not entirely lost even in formal communication, but they are readjusted: in formal speech, "correctness" and "adequacy" are often limited by legal caution, while "clarity" is supported by protocol language, standard patterns, and tools that minimize ambiguity. Nevertheless, implicature is also important in official texts: for example, in English, the modalities would, could, may do not say a command directly, but provide it as a request or instruction, ensuring softness of communication; in Uzbek, the means -sa, mumkin, lozim, maqsadga muvofiq, iltimos qilamiz convey the content of the instruction while maintaining the etiquette. The implication here is that a unit that appears to be a request in form becomes a mandatory instruction in practice within the institutional hierarchy. Thus, as the level of formality increases, the strategy of "gentle-faced commitment" intensifies, and implicitness also becomes a tool of social control.

Presupposition, on the other hand, operates by introducing general knowledge as a "condition" in formal discourse. Presuppositional constructions are expressed in English through signals such as it is noted that, as you are aware, given that, in accordance with, and in Uzbek through units such as it is

known, taking into account, according to, based on. Such tools strengthen the author's position and make the issue not controversial, but "already agreed"; as a result, the addressee's opportunity to express denial or objection is pragmatically narrowed. This phenomenon corresponds to the institutional nature of formal communication: presupposition often serves as a normative support in internal regulations, rules, and official correspondence. Accordingly, implicitness not only "hides" but also performs pragmatic functions such as managing the hierarchy of meaning, limiting the scope of discussion, and shifting the burden of proof onto the addressee [4; 5].

In English and Uzbek official communication, the linguistic pragmatic features of implicitness appear differently. In English, passive constructions that serve to hide the agent (is required, has been decided) give the impression of institutional neutrality by transferring responsibility from the person to the process; in Uzbek, the passive voice (-ildi, -inadi), as well as forms such as "qaror qilindi," "belgilandi," "körib chiqildi" perform the same function. However, in the Uzbek formal style, along with units such as "by the commission" and "management of the organization" denoting a collective subject, forms of politeness characteristic of etiquette (merci, please, it is presented, we inform) are more noticeable; in the English formal style, although there is a standard "courtesy formulae," shorter and more procedural specific patterns often prevail. As a result, the same pragmatic goal is expressed through various formal means: in English, "mitigation" is balanced by modal and lexical minimizers, while in Uzbek, it is balanced by respect, address, and formulation [2; 3].

Strategies of uncertainty and caution stand out as important pragmatic indicators of implicitness. In official English texts, restrictive units such as allegedly, approximately, to the extent possible, and subject to make the

message verifiable and legally secure; in the Uzbek language, units such as approximately, as much as possible, as necessary, in the appropriate manner, and in the manner prescribed by law correspond to this. These elements serve to indicate the boundaries of responsibility, deadline, resource, or authority, rather than to "close" the content. Pragmatically, these tools manage communicative risk: they soften a firm promise, a strict demand, or an absolute assessment, creating an interpretive "buffer" for potential discrepancies that may arise later. Therefore, in formal discourse, implicitness often manifests as a linguistic manifestation of caution [1; 6].

Comparative analysis reveals another aspect: since the "low-context" principle is stronger in English, more explicit clarifications, definitions, and paragraph-by-paragraph instructions are found in official correspondence; Uzbek official communication may, in some cases, rely more on context due to the high importance of social relations and etiquette. However, it is incorrect to interpret this difference as an absolute contradiction: both modern Uzbek official documentation has increased standardization, and there is diplomatic softening and "strategic ambiguity" in English institutional speech. At this point, the scientific question is to determine implicitness not by the measure of "few-many," but by which pragmatic function it performs, in which genre and between which statuses it is used [5; 6].

The genre factor is a central condition for the interpretation of implicitness. For example, in contracts and instructions, implicitness is minimized because legal interpretation cannot tolerate ambiguity; however, even in such texts, presuppositional references ("in accordance with the current order") and patterns that frame the agent are preserved. In genres such as business letters, memoranda, and emails, implicitness is more common due to etiquette, time constraints, and hierarchy: the topic opens quickly, some

grounds are taken as "obvious," and some requirements are wrapped in the form of a request. This situation can lead to danger in pragmatic interpretation: the addressee may read the implicit request as "voluntary" or, conversely, accept the gentle recommendation as a "strict order." Consequently, implicitness not only increases efficiency in formal communication but also serves as a factor that reduces the stability of interpretation.

The comparative results of the study show that in English and Uzbek formal communication, implicitness performs three core pragmatic functions: first, it manages social distance and respect, i.e., mitigates "high-threat" speech acts such as command, refusal, or criticism; second, it distributes institutional responsibility, backgrounds the agent, and presents the decision on behalf of the "system"; third, it saves communication resources by shifting unnecessary detail onto the context. At the same time, the means of performing these functions in both languages are different: while modality and passivity are more central in English, units of formulation, address, and respect play a stronger role in Uzbek. In conclusion, it can be said that implicitness in formal discourse is not a violation of norms, but the result of pragmatic adaptation; its effectiveness is determined by the level of general knowledge, genre requirements, and institutional experience.

Conclusion. In formal communication in English and Uzbek, implicitness is manifested through presupposition and implicature, modality, agent backing, and standard formulas, ensuring diplomatic, cautious, and institutional neutrality of speech. Comparative analysis shows that the main functions of implicitness in both languages are similar, but the linguistic means and etiquette norms differ in their implementation. In formal discourse, implicit meaning can simplify communication, but maintaining a balance between

clarity and mitigation is both scientifically and practically important due to the increased risks of interpretation.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Sodiqov Q. Modern Uzbek Literary Language. - Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 2004. 304 p.

2. Nurmonov A. Pragmatics and issues of speech culture. Тошкент: Фан, 2011.200 p.

3. Grice H. P. Studies in the Way of Words. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 346 p.

4. Brown P., Levinson S. C. Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 345 p.

5. Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman. 250 p.

6. Paducheva E. V. Incitement and its Relation to Reality. Moscow: Nauka, 1985. 272 p.