

Interpretation of the Notion of “Concept” in Cognitive Semantics

KUDAYBERGENOVA SAPIURA POLATBAEVNA
Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article says that the notion of a concept is in the consciousness and thinking of a human being, and categories that unite a general notion and reflect a specific conceptual area make up its semantic field. Anthropocentrism, in turn, allows us to see the central position of a human in speech communication in a general linguistic image and suggests to him the need to refer to his surroundings in search of new concepts of linguistic processes. Functional-semantic circles exhibit large-scale associations of words with distinctive features that are considered voluminous, multifaceted. A semantic field is a set of hierarchically structured lexical units that combine a common concept and reflect a certain conceptual sphere.

Keywords: Cognitive semantics, concept, cognitive approach, vocabulary, anthropocentrism.

INTRODUCTION

Linguists conducting research in the cognitive sphere, proponents of semantics consider the meaning of lexical units, such as the information structure, which is encoded with the help of thoughts in the analysis carried out using the main categories of conceptual realism.

The transition of research to a new level of analysis in the direction of cognitive semantics allows us to solve lexical problems of words in a new way; the lexical structure of a

language can be systematized with a global conceptual framework based on the linguistic image of the universe. In the concept of cognition of the universe, concepts of various samples are created with the help of a language, which help to find the entire volume of semantic components that manifest themselves in the process of communication (Kolshanskiy 2005; Krasnykh 2002).

The development of a cognitive approach to language personnel has helped to understand it as a source of information in the conceptual and cognitive structures of our consciousness and psyche. Language shows evidence that various structures of knowledge about our world do exist in our brain. The cognitive approach makes it possible to expand the methods used in the study and round up the selected object of research, as well as to present the components that have lexical meaning in the system. In cognitive linguistics all linguistic processes depend on the conceptualization and categorization of the universe, from human cognitive activity to the promotion of olfactory language materials. According to the definition of D. S. Likhachova, a conceptual circle is the sum of the concepts of a particular nation. The richer the nation - its folklore, literature, science, art, religion, historical experience, the richer the range of its concepts (Rakhilina 2000: 28-37).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

V. V. Krasnykh gives the following definition of a National Concept: "A national concept, being the most general, highly abstracted, but determined by national and cultural characteristics, is a unit that has undergone conscious cognitive adaptation of the idea of a 'subject' in the sum of all valence bonds and clearly displaced into a language" (Kubryakhova 1995: 284).

Cognitive linguistics proceeds from the active, conscious and creative activity of a human.

V. Z. Demyankov notes that in cognitive linguistics (*homo loquens*), only cognitive structures and processes inherent in humans are considered as such (Kobozeva 2000: 21).

The image of the universe is of paramount importance for human communication. V. I. Postovalova believes that the image of the Universe is a means of harmonizing various spheres of human activity and their interaction, a pledge of human cohesion.

Since language is considered a specific attribute of a human, there is no doubt that a human is a central figure in the linguistic image.

A man is the creator and owner of a language, the main participant in the universe in which he speaks.

A human who performs physical, mental (intellectual) and speech actions is embodied in the linguistic image of his personality as an active, dynamic being. He lives in the nature and in the society. He acts, influences, thinks, understands, feels. A human understands and sees signs of objects and phenomena, their connections and relationships. A human rises to abstract thinking by observing concrete things and phenomena, finding cause-and-effect relationships.

The whole image of the universe, the whole life of a human is reflected in a language and becomes the content of communication.

Language is both objective and subjective at the same time; it is oriented towards the universe and the man. "Language cannot create the universe separately from the human mind, since it represents the human world as a form of reflection of the self-conscious world" (Krasnykh 2002: 26).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The main point of human theoretical and practical activity is anthropocentrism (human orientation). A human, as a subject, interacts with the surrounding nature and the social world, with another person and with himself (self-realization). A man as a cognizing subject and object of cognition is a part of this universe.

In a language, it is impossible to talk about the language factor outside of a human, since all the mental activity of a human has found its expression.

Vezhbitskaya uses a more complete anthropocentric approach to the semantic analysis of linguistic units. The anthropocentricity of language manifests itself not only as a semantic property of the object itself, but also as a principle of its presentation. A. Vezhbitskaya argues that every concept, even those that express some specific thing, reflects the attitude of a human.

The processes of preserving and processing knowledge in the human brain, attracting knowledge into a speech situation, as well as conceptualizing, categorizing and interpreting the experience of the same linguist are manifested in the organization of the internal lexicon of a human [The human factor in a language 1991].

E. V. Rakhilina identifies an object with a human, in almost all languages a human models for himself the direction of objects in space, equating the object with a human, for example, he becomes "neighbor" (from the table to the side), "foot in foot" (under his feet) (Rakhilina 2000: 14).

According to E. S. Kubryakova, anthropocentrism cannot but agree with the opinion that for a human as the main principle of research, his role is to study the object of science and study their conceptual and semantic function in life, that is, to turn a human upside down (Likhachov 1997: 212).

Anthropocentrism, in turn, allows us to see the central position of a human in speech communication in a general linguistic image and suggests to him the need to refer to his surroundings in search of new concepts of linguistic processes.

These processes organize the results of cognition of being in an indissoluble connection according to certain categories. If the process of conceptualization consists in an understandable classification of incoming information, then categorization is aimed at combining even larger categories of speech units that are characterized as resemblance or similarities that manifest themselves in certain relationships (Kubryakov and Skulls). They differ in the end result.

CONCLUSION

For the need to structure the vocabulary of any language in the system tariff, the operation of categorizing it by generalized meanings or concepts that characterize all words of a particular type is a derivative. Concepts are considered to be the generalized meaning of a certain type of words, the refinement of the general semantics of interpretation is manifested in the semantic category of a higher level of abstraction, which includes the particular meaning of a lexical unit. The categorization of a concept that creates an image-model and forms its "prototype" is ontologically accepted (Telia 1991: 97). Z. D. Popova believes that all the problems of cognitive linguistics are the main categories of conceptualization, comprehension, and categorization or revolve around the image of the universe.

The systems make up even larger classes - functional and semantic. Functional-semantic circles exhibit large-scale associations of words with distinctive features that are considered voluminous, multifaceted.

A semantic field is a set of hierarchically structured lexical units that combine a common concept and reflect a certain conceptual sphere.

REFERENCES

- Kobozeva I.M. How we describe the space that we see: the form of objects // Proceedings of the International Seminar "Dialog-2000" on computational linguistics and its applications, Protvino, 2000.p.4
- Kolshanskiy G.V. Contest semantics 2005; p. 26.
- Krasnykh V.V. Ethno psycholinguistics and linguoculturology [Text]/- M.: ITDGC "Gnosis", 2002. p.284
- Kubryakhova E. S. Evolution of linguistic ideas in the second half of the XX century (Experience of paradigmatic analysis) // Language and science of the late 20th century. Moscow, 1995.
- Likhachov D.S. Conceptosphere of the Russian language // Russian Literature: Anthology. Moscow: Academia, 1997.

- Rakhilina E.V. On trends in the development of cognitive semantics // Izvestiya Academy of sciences. Ser. Literature and language.2000. Vol. 59.No.3. p.14
- Telia V.N. Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguoculturological aspects.- M., 1996 p. 97. The human factor in a language 1991.
- Vezhbitskaya A. Semantic universals and description of languages.M.1999.

KUDAYBERGENOVA SAPIURA POLATBAEVNA
ASSISTANT LECTURER,
KARAKALPAK STATE UNIVERSITY, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <SAPURA_1984@MAIL.RU>