



---

## SEMIOTIC SEMANTICS AND LINGUO- COGNITIVE MODELS

Hakimov Muhammad Khojakhonovich  
Professor at Fergana State University,  
Doctor of Philological Sciences

---

### Abstract

This study examines the linguo-cognitive and pragmalinguistic mechanisms underlying implicit meaning, implicit thought, and implicit knowledge in communication. The research is grounded in cognitive linguistics and explores how linguistic and non-linguistic expressions reflect the structure of human cognition. Using examples from Uzbek literary discourse, the paper demonstrates how implicit meanings emerge in context through culturally, religiously, and socially conditioned cognitive frameworks. The analysis focuses on how latent knowledge interacts with lexical and nonverbal cues, revealing the deeper conceptual organization of meaning. The study contributes to the field of cognitive pragmatics by clarifying the hierarchical relationship among implicit knowledge, implicit meaning, and implicit thought, and by identifying their manifestation in communicative acts and literary language.

**Keywords:** Cognitive linguistics, implicit meaning, implicit thought, implicit knowledge, linguo-cognitive model, pragmalinguistics, literary discourse, communication, contextual meaning, conceptualization

### Introduction

Communication is one of the most complex cognitive and social activities of humankind. It involves not only the transmission of verbal information but also the interpretation of unspoken meanings that arise from the interplay between linguistic and cognitive structures. The linguistic content of communication is grounded in the knowledge accumulated in human cognition through interaction with reality. However, not all mental representations are expressed through



---

linguistic means—much of human knowledge remains latent, forming the cognitive foundation of communicative behavior.

Modern linguistic research increasingly focuses on uncovering these implicit layers of meaning, which are not directly encoded in speech but inferred through context, shared experience, and background knowledge. The process of understanding hidden meanings in language—be it lexical, grammatical, or conceptual—constitutes a core concern of cognitive linguistics and pragmalinguistics. These branches of linguistic science explore how the human mind encodes, stores, and retrieves meaning during communication.

The study's relevance lies in its attempt to bridge the theoretical gap between cognitive semantics and pragmatic interpretation by examining implicit meaning as a cognitive category. The paper further aims to demonstrate how linguistic evidence in literary texts reflects the speaker's mental models and worldviews, thereby contributing to a broader understanding of language as a cognitive system.

### **Method and Methodology**

The research employs a descriptive-analytical and cognitive-pragmatic methodology. The study draws upon the theoretical framework of F. de Saussure's linguistic sign theory, L. V. Bondarko's interpretation of implicit meaning, and the cognitive models of linguo-pragmatic interaction.

1. Descriptive Analysis – Linguistic data were extracted from selected Uzbek literary texts (A. Qahhor, A. Qodiriy, and others) to identify expressions containing implicit or hidden meanings.
2. Contextual Interpretation – Each linguistic unit was analyzed in its communicative and cultural context to determine how meaning arises beyond the literal level.
3. Cognitive Mapping – The semantic components were mapped to conceptual structures (concepts, frames, and schemas) representing the speaker's worldview.
4. Comparative Cognitive Analysis – A comparison was made between linguistic and nonverbal implicit expressions to highlight how thought and emotion are encoded differently in communicative acts.



---

The methodological approach integrates cognitive semantics, contextual analysis, and semiotic interpretation to reveal how implicit meaning operates within the mental and linguistic system of communication.

### **Literature Review**

Scholarly inquiry into the implicit dimension of meaning dates back to early structuralist and semiotic traditions, yet it reached conceptual maturity with the rise of cognitive linguistics in the second half of the twentieth century. Foundational works by G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, and L. Talmy established that linguistic meaning is inseparable from human conceptualization and embodied experience.

In Russian and post-Soviet linguistics, L. V. Bondarko introduced the notion of implicit meaning as part of the interpretative function of grammar, emphasizing that much of communication relies on semantically unmarked but contextually significant content. N. D. Arutyunova, E. Kubryakova, and V. Maslova further explored the relationship between implicit semantics and discourse structure, while A. A. Zalevskaya and E. D. Suleymanova developed the notion of linguistic consciousness as a dynamic cognitive system.

In Uzbek linguistics, researchers such as M. Hakimov, A. Madvaliyev, and S. Karimov have advanced the study of linguocognitive models and the interaction of thought and language. Their works stress that the implicit dimensions of meaning are culturally conditioned and cannot be analyzed without reference to national worldview and communicative norms.

This study builds upon these theoretical traditions, aiming to operationalize the categories of implicit knowledge, implicit meaning, and implicit thought as analytical tools for understanding cognitive and communicative processes in literary discourse.

### **The main part**

Participants in communication interact with one another through various means and methods. The foundation of communication lies in the information and knowledge accumulated in human cognition as a result of perceiving reality. Only a part of the concepts, knowledge, representations, and views that exist in the



human mind are expressed through linguistic and non-linguistic means. The remaining portion is preserved in human cognition as large-scale informational content. This body of knowledge constitutes a general cognitive fund, forming a linguo-cognitive coding system that enables mutual exchange of ideas among communicants.

The study of un verbalized thoughts – which constitute the main part of human cognition—through linguistic evidence that indirectly refers to them, has attracted the attention of many researchers. The semantic structure of discourse or text, which serves as the foundation of communication and interaction, as well as the investigation of implicit meanings contained within them, are regarded as key research objects of modern linguistic disciplines.

In connection with the study of communication processes, the growing interest in exploring texts, speech, and the implicit ideas of their participants has led to the emergence of “two interesting and relevant branches of linguistics: cognitive linguistics and covert pragmalinguistics,” which are now recognized as entirely new directions in linguistic science. The author of this view emphasizes the necessity of approaching the study of hidden meanings in texts from a pragmalinguistic perspective. Hidden meaning manifests itself as implicative content—that is, as thoughts based on implicit semantics, inferred meanings, and intonation nuances [1, p. 46].

The term “implication” is derived from the Latin *implicatio*, which means interweaving, entanglement, or complex connection. The concept of implication represents a complex expression formed through the logical interrelation of two or more propositions [2, p. 194]. It is, therefore, a product of logical reasoning.

Indeed, the process of verbal communication, being a multidimensional phenomenon, encompasses new directions of linguistic inquiry. In this regard, cognitive linguistics focuses its attention on the study of materialized thoughts expressed through linguistic means as well as on the subtle shades of meaning that, while implied, remain an integral part of the author’s speech structure. It investigates the cognitive foundations and pragmatic nature of implicit meanings – such as concealed semantic nuances, hidden intentions conveyed through pronunciation and intonation, and latent ideas appearing between the lines of a text or verse. It is well known that meanings and semantic nuances materialized



through linguistic units belong to the domain of purely linguistic analysis. However, the implicative system of language, though related to the content of communication embodied in text or discourse, ultimately traces back to concepts inherent to human cognition, which serves as the core category of cognitive linguistics. The notion of concept is directly connected with the worldview of the speakers of a particular language and nation. For instance, perceptions of beauty vary across cultures; they are defined relative to the collective fund of knowledge about the world shared by individuals – male or female – within a given society. Some associate the concept of beauty solely with notions of elegant attire or outward adornment, while others link it to the harmony between an individual's inner and outer worldview. The set of perceptions of beauty infused with moral, national, and religious values constitutes the conceptual representation of beauty. Thus, the linguistic naming of positive or negative evaluations of reality arises from the cognitive basis of conceptual thinking. Consequently, the essence of linguistic nominations grounded in conceptual structures can be traced to cognitive processes – issues that remain among the unresolved problems of cognitive linguistics and pragmalinguistics. As noted by scholars, “Cognitive sciences – particularly cognitive linguistics, its structural components, and the development of related scientific concepts – began to take shape in the mid-twentieth century. Unlike the approaches of logical analysis of language, communicative linguistics, and pragmalinguistics, cognitive linguistics, even at its early stages, incorporated non-linguistic concepts and theoretical frameworks that seemed, at first glance, unrelated to language itself. Conceptual schemes, metaphorical models, frames, modules, image schemas, and conceptual integrations – once regarded as meaningless or even ‘beyond reason’ terms – have become the basis for new and insightful conclusions about the nature of the linguistic system” [3]. At present, this conception constitutes the initial framework of cognitive linguistics, and the above-mentioned terminological apparatus pertains not only to linguocognitology, but also to a broader range of disciplines encompassed within the anthropocentric paradigm, reflecting the interrelation between language, cognition, and human thought. According to linguo-cognitive models, the phenomenon of implicitness can be classified into the following cognitive forms:





1. implicit knowledge,
2. implicit meaning,
3. implicit thought.

Implicit knowledge functions as a latent factor that supplements linguistic meaning and manifests itself through certain linguistic forms depending on contextual conditions. The concept of “implicit meaning” was introduced into science by L. V. Bondarko, who considered it a component of interpretative cognition. It constitutes the semantically unmarked part of grammatical categories. In discourse, implicit knowledge integrates automatically into the context through linguistic observation, producing **implicit thoughts**. Importantly, implicit thought in speech and implicit linguistic meaning differ from one another [4, p. 10]. L. V. Bondarko’s analyses of implicit meaning and thought are noteworthy. In this respect, by continuing the author’s views on the category of implicitness—including implicit meaning, implicit thought, and implicit knowledge—we attempt to distinguish among them more precisely. In the initial sections of this dissertation, it was emphasized that the conceptual foundation of this research rests upon F. de Saussure’s conception of the linguistic sign and the dichotomy between language and speech. According to this theory, the lexical inventory and grammatical rules of a given language are preserved in the collective memory of its speakers. These linguistic units serve as instruments for expressing ideas and thoughts and act as a reservoir of communication ensuring mutual interaction between communicants. In this sense, the author of a literary text constructs the content of his work through thoughts grounded in the lexical units stored in this cognitive-linguistic reservoir. However, participants in communication do not always fully perceive the lexical meaning of every word. For example...

Nihoyat, qumg‘on qaynadi. Unsin naridan-beri choy damladi, quruq yantoq va qamishlarga o‘t ketmasin uchun o‘tni tepkilab o‘chirdi; o‘ng qo‘lida choynak va chap qo‘lida qumg‘on, o‘tning shu‘lasidan ko‘zi hanuz qamashib borar ekan, bir joyda yer o‘pirilib, chap oyog‘i **taqimigacha** botib ketdi va oyog‘ining uchi yumshoq bir narsaga tekkanday bo‘ldi (A.Qahhor. “Dahshat”).

In the given text, the lexical meaning of the word “taqim” (the back part of the knee) is not uniformly understood by all readers. In particular, in the expression



“sochi taqimini o‘padi”, the word taqim may be interpreted lexically as ankle or heel. Thus, when referring to the word taqim, the conceptual understanding associated with its lexical meaning contributes to the formation of meaning, and as a result, it becomes clear that the proper lexical sense of taqim is the back part of the knee. Different interpretations concerning the meaning of taqim may lead to both correct and incorrect conceptualizations. Therefore, misinterpretation of a lexical unit used in a literary text, or misunderstanding of its underlying lexical concept, can serve as the basis for forming inaccurate thoughts or interpretations. In essence, thought represents the author’s attitude toward the phenomena of reality. The following text fragment also illustrates a similar situation, where semantic misunderstanding of a word influences the comprehension of the author’s idea.

Unsin bir necha qadam bosganidan keyin **paranji-chimmati** sag‘ananing oldida qolganini eslab to‘xtadi, lekin qaytib borgani botinolmadi, hozir qaytish emas, qayrilib qaragani ham yuragi dov bermas, nazarida hamma o‘liklar sag‘analardan, go‘rlardan boshini chiqarib, ketidan qarab turganday edi (A.Qahhor. “Dahshat”). In this case as well, general cultural and conceptual understandings of “paranji–chimmat” (the traditional veil and face covering) serve as the foundation for the formation of thought. The paranji and the chimmat are interpreted as separate components: paranji referring to the full-body covering, while chimmat denotes the part that conceals the face. Thus, “paranji–chimmat” constitutes an implicit idea related to the traditional garment of Muslim women (of that historical period).

Similarly, implicit knowledge emerges as a contextual phenomenon, appearing as a result of the accumulation of conceptual and experiential knowledge in the mind under the influence of certain stimulus units within a literary text. The general conceptualizations of taqim and paranji–chimmat function as implicit knowledge in the context, enriching the reader’s interpretive framework. Implicit thought, in turn, is intentionally employed by the author within the literary text. The writer alludes to these implicit thoughts through specific contextual cues, inviting the reader to reconstruct the underlying meaning beyond the literal expression. For instance, ...



Mol ketti – jon ketti, ishka ham qo‘lim bormaydi. Endi bo‘lar ish bo‘lg‘on desang yurak achiydi, dastmoya ham g‘altakka chiqadigan. Arza-parza bittirsammi deyman. Ko‘chada unga-bunga kengash solsam, arzang ma‘qul deyishdi. Shu yaqinda, o‘zi o‘rdada turadig‘an bir arzachi bor emish. Ketkan ustiga ketkan deb do‘kon tegi yarimta bo‘z bor ekan, qo‘ltug‘img‘a tiqib oldim. Ana shu toblarda so‘rog‘lab arzachi mirzonikiga borsam, hozir o‘rdadan kelib, endi to‘nini yechib turg‘an ekan. Yosh, navqiron yigit, “salom, alik”, “horma”, “bor bo‘l”. “Shunday, shunday gap; bir parcha arza bittirsam, deb kelgan edim”. O‘rdaliqqa gap uqdirish qiyomatdan keyin, taqsir. Lekin bu yigitda **gavrlik** siyohi yo‘q. Shukur so‘fi. Gapka qonib olib, quloq qoqmay “xo‘b”. Arzaning bir yeriga zakotchining oti tushar ekan, necha qayta so‘rasa ham bilmadim, undan keyin afti basharasini uqdirib edim, tasmollab bittasini otini yozdi, chog‘i. “Endi keta bering, arzani o‘zim topshiraman”, – deydi. Javobini ham ikki kundan keyin o‘zidan olar emishman... (A.Qodiriy. “Mehrobdan chayon”).

In the above passage, the word “gavrlik” (literally derived from gavur, meaning “infidel” or “non-believer”) is interpreted by the author through implicit knowledge. The writer uses this word not merely in its direct lexical meaning — gavur, gabr (fire-worshipper, or one who does not follow Islam) — but in a contextualized, figurative sense, as in “gavrlik siyohi yo‘q”, meaning “he is not a fire-worshipper” or “he acknowledges Islam.”

Here, implicit meaning functions as a contextual phenomenon that is not explicitly revealed linguistically, but rather perceived through the reader’s comprehension of the word and its associative lexical background during the reading process.

For instance, such expressions rely not on the direct denotative meaning of the word but on cultural, religious, and historical associations embedded in the reader’s collective consciousness. The implicit sense thus emerges through interpretation, revealing the writer’s attitude and evaluative stance, rather than through overt linguistic markers.

– Xo‘p, lafzimdan qaytmayman, mana xotirjam bo‘la qol: men hozir seni bir taloq qo‘ydim, qaytib kelganingdan keyin uch taloqsan! Bor, qumg‘onni ko‘tar!..  
**Unsin dodxodan darrov yuzini berkitganicha** chiqib ketdi (A.Qahhor. “Dahshat”).





In this context, the sentence “Unsin dodhodan darrov yuzini berkitganicha chiqib ketdi” (“She immediately covered her face and left Dodkho’s presence”) conveys an implicit meaning based on nonverbal expression that alludes to the concept of “nomahram” (a person of the opposite gender who is not permissible to see unveiled). This implicit meaning reflects an implicit thought, which in turn relies on implicit knowledge related to religious and cultural notions of modesty and gender separation. Thus, the implicit thought arises not merely from the verbal component of the sentence, but from the cultural and religious background knowledge shared by the community — the understanding that a woman’s act of covering her face in the presence of a non-relative man signifies observance of Islamic norms of propriety and modesty.

## **Conclusion**

The findings of this research indicate that implicit knowledge, implicit meaning, and implicit thought represent three interrelated but distinct cognitive categories that together shape the interpretative process in communication.

- Implicit knowledge constitutes the repository of background information shared by communicants, activated in specific contextual situations.
- Implicit meaning emerges when linguistic forms evoke latent semantic associations not overtly expressed in the text.
- Implicit thought is the interpretative outcome derived from the interaction between linguistic stimuli and cognitive frameworks.

The study demonstrates that literary discourse serves as an effective medium for revealing the mechanisms of implicit cognition, since authors deliberately embed unspoken meanings to engage readers’ interpretive capacities. Furthermore, it highlights that implicit meaning is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a cognitive-pragmatic process shaped by cultural, religious, and emotional dimensions of human experience.

In conclusion, the exploration of implicit meaning from a linguo-cognitive perspective deepens our understanding of the human mind’s role in communication. It bridges the divide between linguistic form and mental content, reinforcing the anthropocentric view that language is not merely a tool for communication, but a manifestation of human thought itself.



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,  
Education, and Pedagogy***

**ISSN (E): 3067-7874**

**Volume 01, Issue 08, November, 2025**

**Website: usajournals.org**

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution  
4.0 International License.***

---

**References**

1. Матвеева Г.Г. Основы прагмалингвистики. – М.: Инфра-М, 2022. – С. 46.
2. Словарь иностранных слов. – М.: Русский язык, 1988. – С. 194.
3. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kontseptsiya-a-a-potebni-v-svete-kognitivnoy-lingvistiki-uchenie-o-slove>
4. Ермакова Е.В. Имплицитность в художественном тексте (на материале русскоязычной и англоязычной прозы психологического и фантастического реализма): автореф. дисс... док. филол.наук. – Саратов, 2010. – С. 10.