

Semiological Semantics and the Category of Explicitness

Gaziyeva Maftuna Muhammadovna

Associate Professor of FSU

Abstract: The study of semantics has garnered significant attention from linguists due to its complexity and interdisciplinary applications. Although traditionally confined to lexical meanings, recent research has expanded its scope to include all language levels, encompassing phonetics, syntax, and pragmatics. This paper explores the evolution of semantic theories, highlighting their relevance across linguistic systems. The interplay between explicit and implicit meanings, the dynamics of linguistic activity, and the processes of explication are analyzed. By examining the contributions of prominent scholars and integrating insights from modern linguistic paradigms, this study aims to redefine the boundaries of semantics in contemporary linguistic discourse.

Keywords: semantics, linguistic levels, explicitness, implicitness, explication, linguistic activity, propositional structure, cognitive processes, linguistic paradigms, lexical semantics.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

Introduction

Semantics, a pivotal field within linguistics, has long been limited to lexical meanings and their related phenomena, such as polysemy, synonymy, and antonymy. However, modern linguistic research underscores the necessity of broadening its focus to include phonetic, syntactic, and pragmatic elements. This paper examines the theoretical and practical aspects of semantics, emphasizing its interdisciplinary implications. By analyzing its role in language systems and communicative contexts, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of semantic phenomena, including explicitness, implicitness, and explication.

Literature Review

The foundational works of scholars such as G. Frege, C. Peirce, and L.V. Sherba have significantly shaped the study of semantics. Frege and Peirce introduced concepts like denotation, signification, and intentionality, which remain integral to logical semantics. L.V. Sherba's exploration of linguistic activity as a process of speaking and understanding provides a cognitive perspective on semantics. Recent contributions, including Sh. Safarov's studies on lexical semantics and A. Nurmonov's investigations into syntactic semantics, have expanded the field's boundaries. Additionally, the emergence of terms like phonosemantics and poetic semantics illustrates the increasing interdisciplinary applications of semantic theories.

Methods and Methodology

This study employs a qualitative approach, combining textual analysis and theoretical synthesis. Primary and secondary sources, including academic texts, terminological dictionaries, and literary works, are analyzed to explore semantic theories and their practical applications. The methodological framework includes:

Onomasiological analysis to investigate the naming process and its relation to meaning.

Semasiological analysis to examine the meanings of linguistic units in different contexts.

Contextual and propositional analyses to understand the explicit and implicit structures within linguistic expressions.

The main part

The issues of semantics, which have not been studied in linguistics until now and have attracted the attention of researchers for many years, remain as relevant as ever. Although the term semantics is present in the system of terms such as phonetics, lexicology, morphemics, morphology, syntax, and stylistics in linguistics, semantics issues have been recognized as a phenomenon of only one level. In the scientific literature on the subject, the object of study of semantics is associated only with the meaning of words and phrases. In particular, "...semantics remains primarily a science of lexical meaning, and its focus is on such phenomena as word polysemy, antonymy, synonymy, homonymy, and valency possibilities..." [Safarov Sh. Semantics. – Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2013. – P. 14.] Semantics, in its relation to phenomena such as the expansion and narrowing of the meaning of lexical units, cannot leave the scope of lexical-“semantics, but remains a source of studying the stages of change in the meaning content of lexical units and the shift in meaning” [Safarov Sh. Ibid. – P. 15.]. The above-mentioned ideas on the problems of semantics and the definition of its object of study are evident in all the literature on the subject. However, in linguistics and among linguists, a tendency has long been emerging to define the semantic content not only in relation to the lexical level of the language, but also in relation to all language level units. Therefore, it is not correct to limit the scope of semantics only to phenomena related to the meaning of lexical units, but the study of all level units of the semantic level of the language within the scope of semantics is becoming an actual problem of the field. The practice of applying the term semantics not only to lexisemantics itself, but also to phonetic-phonological, lexical and grammatical units, and even to new areas of linguistics, is proving to be correct. In particular, concepts expressed by terminological units such as phono-semantics, lexical semantics, syntactic semantics, and poetic semantics contribute to the emergence of new knowledge and theories in the field. As A. Nurmonov emphasizes, “although linguistic semantics, including syntactic semantics, is a relatively new area of linguistics, today various semantic directions and schools have emerged that approach it differently. These semantic directions and schools, since they use their own different systems of understanding and terms, are not consistent with each other, and in some places even contradict each other” [Nurmonov A. Selected Works. Volume III. Volume I. – Tashkent: Akadernashr, 2012. – P. 124.]. Indeed, in today's linguistics, various concepts and terms related to the direction of semantics are used, and the ideas that some of these terminological units are essentially mutually exclusive are correct from a scientific point of view. It should be noted that there is a view that all of them express meaning when they are used in a word. In specialized dictionaries, this term is explained as follows: “semantics is a Greek word, and semantics means expressive meaning. The content, meaning side of linguistic units” [Hodzhiev A. Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1985. - P. 74.]. However, phonetic-phonological units have a functional feature, they do not convey meaning, they serve to differentiate meaning. The lexical level units of the language serve to express meaning. The basic unit of the syntactic level is the sentence, which performs the function of

conveying information. As can be seen, if the term semantics applies to all levels and level units of the language, then all of them should also serve to express meaning. However, the units belonging to all three levels of the language acquire their own functionality, and from the point of view of their level system and category, they have a single functional essence. However, when a person engages in linguistic activity using a certain language, each of his expressive forms and the functionalization of the linguistic unit contained in this form results in semantic actualization. This, of course, is based on the concept of language and speech, which was developed by F. de Saussure. Linguistic activity occurs due to the activation of inactive linguistic units in the imagination of speakers of a particular language. The speech situation and various communication situations create the opportunity for speakers to use the linguistic reserve. In the scientific literature, such ideas are also common: "...the center of any linguistic activity is the individual. Therefore, L.V.Sherba defines linguistic activity as the process of speaking and understanding. Through the senses, a person reflects the signs of the elements of the objective world in a generalized form, and this generalized image of the objective world, reflected in the mind, is transmitted to the listener through language codes"[Nurmonov A. Selected works. Volume III. Volume I. – Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2012. – P. 324.]. So, when it comes to linguistic activity, two things should be considered separately. This is a phenomenon that encompasses the process associated with speaking and understanding. In fact, the term linguistic activity, in essence, should include the concept of thinking in the paradigm of "speaking and understanding" [Nurmonov A. Ibid. - P. 324.]. However, major linguists, since the term "activity" is preceded by the term "linguistic", and in order not to deviate from the system of linguistic concepts, use the words "speaking" and "understanding". In our opinion, the word "understanding" itself also has a conceptual feature, and it is well known that this word is closer to logic than to linguistics, and they are included in the class of categories related to the essence of linguistic concepts as related, related terms. Thus, in the paradigm of directions belonging to the linguistic system, such terms as speaking, understanding, thinking serve to reveal the essence of linguistic semantics. As A. Nurmanov rightly emphasizes, the semantics of linguistic units is determined from the onomasiological side in relation to the process of speech formation, and from the semasiological side in relation to the objective content of speech, its propositional structure.

Why did we start this part of our work with the term semantics, why do we think about semantic theories? In our opinion, semantics is not only specific to the lexical system of a language from the point of view of linguistic theory, but also, based on the paradigm of discourse theory, the transition of all language level units from the passive to the real and active layers, as well as the transition from denotative meaning to connotation, from the usual meaning to the occasional meaning (occasional meaning from Latin *occasionalis* - accidental meaning, meaning the meaning of the word in the semantic structure of the word). The shift to the unformed, realized in a certain individual use [Hojiev A. Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1985. - P. 63.]) has an impact on the content of the speech and its larger contexts. Therefore, all terminological units belonging to the above-mentioned semantic system help communicators to correctly understand not only the meaning, but also the signs associated with the concept, idea, concept, and content.

As is known, the categories of meaning and content have been of constant interest to philosophers, logicians, psychologists, and linguists for many years. Therefore, the categories of explicitness and implicitness encompass the structures of meaning and content that are realized through linguistic and non-linguistic means of expression. Professor Sh. Safarov expresses the following opinion about these terminological units and their introduction into linguistics: "The theoretical ideas of the German mathematician and logician G. Frege and the American philosopher - the founder of the science of semiotics, C. Peirce, gave impetus to the formation and development of the field of logical semantics. The terms "denotation", "signification", "intentional", "extensional", "implicative" currently used by semioticians are a legacy of semiotics and logic. In addition to the

above terms, terms such as "explicit" and "implicit" also entered linguistics through pragmatic linguistics research.

The emergence of new areas such as cognitive linguistics, pragmatic linguistics, linguopoetics, and linguo-aesthetics within the system of the paradigm of linguistic concepts itself requires the separation of the object of linguistic research in the field of semantics into two groups.

It is known that the phenomena associated with the system of speech and understanding are considered cognitive processes. The linguistic system of a language and the meanings they express exist in the minds of the owner of the language and the community that uses it, and they are stored in implicit models. The essence of the elements of the linguistic system, which have a material form, is connected with the process of thinking and is inherent in human thinking. Thus, the elements of the linguistic system, which are present in the memory of a certain people and the speakers of the language belonging to this people, acquire an explicit status when they are expressed through verbal means. The term explicit or explicitness is explained in specialized linguistic dictionaries as follows: "explicitness is derived from the English word "explicit", which means the explicit expression of thought in a sign. In addition, the term explicit actualizer is also given" [Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. – M.: Soviet encyclopedia, 1969. – P. 523.], the conceptual essence expressed by this compound term can be understood as the explicitly actualized part of the thought. "The term actualizer is derived from the English word "means (agent) of actualization" and means an actualizing agent. This term refers to the functions of linguistic means in real speech interaction, the expression of real meanings in a certain context with the help of virtual elements of the linguistic system. Actualization is the transfer of linguistic units into speech or the actualization of a virtual linguistic sign, a real act of a linguistic means associated with speech. In addition, the term explicit actualizer also exists, which is defined as the actualization of a linguistic sign that has the value of a formal expression" [Akhmanova O.S. Ibid. – P. 36-37.]. Thus, the term explicitness arose on the basis of new directions in linguistics as a phenomenon related to the contextual meaning of the elements of the linguistic system and related to the content structure of the language. The verbal expression of meaning or ideas that are present in the minds of communication participants or that are in the imagination of interlocutors in connection with a real contextual situation is considered an explicit phenomenon. In the scientific literature, there are views on the explicit expression of ideas, which are defined precisely in the process of elucidating implicit content categories. To express an idea openly, they use the term "explicit content of the expression" (eksplitsitnyy so d erjaniem vyskazyvaniya ESV). A message directly expressed using a set of linguistic signs is called the explicit content of the expression [K. Dolinin. A. Implitsitnoe so d erjanie vyskazyvaniya // Voprosy yazykoznanija. – 1983. – No. 6. – S. 37.]. Thus, the content structure expressed directly through verbal means is called explicit content, which occurs at the expense of the implicit meanings of linguistic units. This is explained by the correct expression of the lexical and grammatical meanings of linguistic units in a speech or text, when explained by the concepts expressed in the term ("external meaning (Latin usus - custom, rule) in the semantic structure of the word, formed meaning, accepted, commonly used meaning" [Hojiev A. Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1985. - P. 96.] as a result, an explicit content structure is formed. The explicit content structure of a speech or text is information about facts.

In the process of explicating ideas about the content level of language, there is also the term explication, which should be explained as a completely different phenomenon related to the contextual content structure. It would be more correct to explain this phenomenon as the disclosure of thoughts deliberately hidden by the author in the text through verbal means. In this regard, M. Khakimov, while considering the tagma as one of the main problems of pragmatics, chooses an original example from a literary source to explain the essence of the phenomenon. The literary source cited as the basis perfectly demonstrates the essence of the phenomenon of tagma'no [Khakimov M. Fundamentals of Uzbek Pragmalinguistics. – Tashkent: Akademyashr,

2013. – P. 100. J. However, no opinion is expressed here about the phenomenon of explication. In our opinion, the theory of the presence of implicit thought in a literary text is also quite correct. However, the explication of implicit thought should be analyzed as a separate phenomenon. For example,

- *Saodat, – dedim. Qaradi. O‘choqda yongan olov issig‘idanmi yoki uyatdanmi uning yuzi qip–qizil olma edi. Qo‘lidagi sochig‘i bilan oldimg‘a yaqin kelib to‘xtadi. – Eshitdingmi, – dedim. Yerga qaradi. Uni ortiqcha uyaltirmas uchun eshikka qarab yuriy boshladim–da, – Maylimi? – deb so‘radim. Javob o‘rniga*
- *Osh yemay ketasizmi? – dedi. **Bu uning ikkinchi turlik qilib aytilgan “mayli” javobi edi** (A.Qodiriy).*

(– Saodat, – I said. He looked. Whether it was from the heat of the fire burning in the oven or from embarrassment, his face was red as a crimson apple. He came close to me with a towel in his hand and stopped. – Did you hear that, – I said. He looked at the ground. I started to look at the door so as not to embarrass him too much, but – Do you want to? – I asked. Instead of answering, he said – Are you going to eat? – This was his second type of “do you want to” answer (A. Kadiriy).

Saodat's consent to marry Alim is also embedded in another contextual proposition. Indeed, the implicit idea in the content of "Yes, I agree to marry you" was expressed in her sentence "Will you go without eating?" The implicit meaning embedded in the content of the proposition "Will you go without eating?" in Saodat's speech is explicated in the author's statement "This was his second kind of "willing" answer." In fact, in the above context, the expression “Are you going to eat?” belongs to the propositional structure of the text, and the tagma'no is embedded in the content of this proposition. The idea expressed through the tagma'no belongs to Esa Saodat, and the explication of the implicit meaning is expressed explicitly with the author's explanation. Therefore, this type of explication can be called author-specific explication. Other types of explication of hidden meaning, hidden thought, or hidden knowledge can also be encountered. Depending on the type of text or the communicative purpose of the author, the paradigm of intertextuality can be used to express hidden thoughts openly. Based on this paradigm, the author can use texts from other sources before revealing his communicative purpose. It is precisely these texts that perform a deictic function, indicating the main idea that the author intends to convey. The purpose for which the text itself was included in the literary text by the author is revealed in the previous or subsequent content structures. For example, in the first paragraph of Said Ahmad's "Epic about Book Lovers and Book Lovers", the passage about an illiterate and literate executioner is presented as a contextual tag. The author's thoughts about illiterate and literate critics in the next paragraph are an explication of the above tag. Therefore, it is appropriate to call this explication an intertextual explication.

"Explication" in the existing literature on the field [Voronushkina O.V. Vidy skrytyx smyslov i sposoby ix explikatsii // <https://journals-altspu.ru/vestnik/article/download/51/50/199>; Alekseytseva T.A. Eksplikatsiya ili beskonechnoe porozdenie smysla // <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/eksplikatsiya-ili-beskonechnoe-porozhdenie-smysla>; Khudyakov A.A. K probleme yazykovyx sredstv eksplikatsii smysla vyskazyvaniya // <http://professor-hudyakov.ru/pdf/2001-explication.pdf> (access date: 09/25/2023).] there are also views on the essence of the concept represented by the term. O.V. Voronushkina in her article “Latent Thought Manifestations and Methods of Their Explication” explains this phenomenon in detail. “Understanding latent thought, in turn, is connected with the understanding of the term “multiple thoughts”. In any expression or texts composed by the speaker and the addressee contain several ideas. In the study of implicit ideas, it is necessary to take into account the message or information that is not explicitly stated. However, it is impossible to study hidden thoughts in a literary text without lexical-semantic complexes, grammatical phenomena, presuppositions or propositions,

intentional or motivated understandings. The functionalization of hidden thoughts is observed in the act of communication based on the interaction of speakers”[Voronushkina O.V. Types of hidden meanings and methods of their explication // <https://journals-altspu.ru/vestnik/article/download/51/50/199> (access date: 25.09.2023).]. Thus, the term explication, as distinguished from the term explicitness, is the explicit expression of an idea that has arisen in the minds of communicants and that should have been hidden in the text, through verbal means, and has a verbal status. In a literary text, the author hides some ideas depending on the speech situation, but The phenomenon of explication of thoughts should be evaluated in terms of their verbal status. The explicit expression of an idea is its verbal status. The phenomenon of explication itself expresses two properties. The first property is the verbal expression of the idea, that is, the expression of the idea in an explicit text, while the second is the method of revealing the implicit knowledge in the thinking of the communicators to the content level. The explication of ideas through linguistic means “...the movement from uncertainty to certainty is the goal of epistemological activity. In his turn, J. Munen noted the need for linguistics to clarify how non-linguistic semantics (unmaterialized thought - M.G.), which emerged on the basis of logical experience, is reflected in linguistic semantics... The object of linguistics is only a small part of semantics, which is the meaning expressed through linguistic signs or The meaning of linguistic units at different levels is formed, and the basic linguistic semantics is outside the scope of the meaning of linguistic units. It should be distinguished from the “non-linguistic semantics” [Safarov Sh. Semantics. – Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2013. – P. 15-16.], that is, from the semantics of thoughts in thought. Thus, semantics consists of two types, which are first The meaning and ideas in thought are divided into semantics. The materialization of ideas in thought with linguistic means is the transformation of non-linguistic semantics into linguistic semantics. For example,

✓ *Guvohlaringiz bormi? – deb so‘radi.*

✓ *Guvohmi? – deb so‘radi Asadbek, so‘ng telefonni ko‘rsatdi: – Ana, guvoh. Aeroportga telefon qil.*

✓ *Meni sensiramang, – deb yana tanbeh berdi tergovchi.*

“Sendaqalarning jonini Kesakpolvon kirg‘izib qo‘yar edi. Baxtingga u o‘lib ketdi”, deb o‘yladi Asadbek, unga g‘azab bilan tikilib. Alhol tergovchi yana biron nima deb tanbeh bersa, Asadbekdan shirin gap eshitmasligi aniq edi (T.Malik. “Shaytanat”).

(– Do you have any witnesses? – he asked.

✓ A witness? – Asadbek asked, then showed the phone: – There, a witness. Call the airport.

✓ Don’t touch me, – the investigator scolded again.

“Kesakpolvon would have killed your friends. Luckily, he died,” Asadbek thought, staring at him angrily. It was clear that if the investigator reprimanded him for anything else, he would not hear sweet words from Asadbek (T. Malik. “Shaytanat”).

According to the content of the above-mentioned artistic context, implicit thoughts arise in the thinking of the characters due to their dialogical communication. Such thoughts are organized within the framework of non-linguistic semantics. Contextual thoughts inherent in thinking are revealed by the author with the help of linguistic means and are transformed into a propositional structure in the text. This is the process of explication of thoughts. Such structures that have a linguistic status are considered the object of study of linguistic semantics. In particular, “...a linguistic sign that has a ambivalent mood and the form of speech expression of this sign, the first part of which is considered a product of the thought process, is called primary semiosis, which has a structural and semantic-nominative form. The second part of the heuristic mode is considered a product of the thinking process and is called secondary semiosis, which is based on the emergence

of thought in the communicative act of the contextual and situational context of the speech segment. Therefore, meaning is a property of language, and thought is a property of speech. Thoughts are divided into habitual and occasional types. Thus, although the concepts of meaning and thought are inextricably linked, they are not identical phenomena. That is why G. G. Pochepsov suggests that it is necessary to distinguish between the types of transition from meaning to thought. This can be shown with special terminological units in the way of transition from meaning to thought, from content to message" [Khudyakov A.A. K probleme yazykovykh sredstv eksplikatsii smysla vyskazyvaniya // <http://professor-hudyakov.ru/pdf/2001-explication.pdf> (date of reference: 22.09.2023).].

“Explicit imagery facilitates the interpretation of the text’s content. The author, by expressing his thoughts in an explicit manner, shares his point of view with the reader. In order for the reader to understand and understand the text, he repeatedly expresses the content of the assessment, reflecting his attitude to the events being described, using various methods” [Kukhareno V. A. Interpretation of the text. – M.: Prosveshchenie, 1988. – P. 180.]. The most important aspect of a literary text is that the emotional and axiological content structure, associated with the mood of the author and the characters of the work, is often expressed in a hidden way. The more implicit the author's point of view is, the more valuable the work becomes. It is advisable for the author to convey the content structures inherent in the characters and heroes, such as inner feelings, sadness, pain, and longing, through closed means of expression. Bringing them into the open text weakens the artistic qualities of the text. In addition, the author's attitude should not be involved in the expression of hidden thoughts. The author should remain cool in the implicit depiction of events. A message based on hidden thoughts is considered more important than a message expressed openly. Communication participants are quickly affected by the thoughts implicit in the process of communication, just as a bookworm is engaged in reading a work of art. Sometimes they are angry, sometimes they are overly happy. Therefore, in the process of communication or reading a work of art, the listener feels different when he enters into a dialogue with the author, perceiving implicit thoughts.

The linguistic system is an open linguistic system in which the ideas expressed in terms of units are related to the propositional structure of the language, and such a content structure and the verbal units that serve to express them are analyzed. This open linguistic system is grouped into certain grammatical categories with linguistic concepts. The division of such units into grammatical categories is carried out on the basis of morphological and syntactic principles. Since grammatical categories are verbal units that serve to express information, the information expressed with the help of these means is explicated as a propositional structure. This is a linguistic encapsulation of ideas based on imagination in the thinking of communication participants.

Conclusion

The study reaffirms the necessity of expanding semantic research beyond lexical boundaries to encompass all linguistic levels. It highlights the dynamic interaction between explicit and implicit meanings and the role of linguistic activity in semantic actualization. By integrating traditional and modern approaches, this research contributes to the ongoing evolution of semantic theories, providing a foundation for future interdisciplinary studies in linguistics and cognitive sciences.

References

1. Сафаров Ш. Семантика. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2013. – Б. 14.
2. Нурмонов А. Танланган асарлар. III жилдли. I жилд. – Тошкент: Akademnashr, 2012. – Б. 124.

3. Ҳожиев А. Лингвистик терминларнинг изоҳли луғати. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1985. – Б. 74.
4. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Сов.энциклопедия, 1969. – С. 523.
5. Долинин К. А. ИмPLICITное содержание высказывания // Вопросы языкознания. – 1983. – № 6. – С. 37.
6. Ҳақимов М. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. – Тошкент: Akademnashr, 2013. – Б. 100.
7. Воронушкина О.В. Виды скрытых смыслов и способы их экспликации // <https://journals-altspu.ru/vestnik/article/download/51/50/199>
8. Алексейцева Т.А. Экспликация или бесконечное порождение смысла // <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/eksplikatsiya-ili-beskonechnoe-porozhdenie-smysla>; 9. Худяков А.А. К проблеме языковых средств экспликации смысла высказывания // <http://professor-hudyakov.ru/pdf/2001-explication.pdf> (murojaat sanasi: 25.09.2023).
9. Воронушкина О.В. Виды скрытых смыслов и способы их экспликации // <https://journals-altspu.ru/vestnik/article/download/51/50/199> (murajaat sanasi: 25.09.2023).
10. Кухаренко В. А. Интерпретация текста. – М.: Просвещение, 1988. – С. 180.