CONCEPT AS THE MAIN NOTION OF MODERN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Buranova Dildora

EFL teacher

Termez state university

ABSTRACT: *In this article, the cognitive approach to integration considers a word as a linguistic sign with a multicomponent semantic structure, which is an integrative unity due to the interaction of lexical and grammatical meanings. Within the framework of the word, grammatical and semantic integration is observed, carried out by components of different nature and autonomy on the basis of compatibility or incompatibility of the corresponding concepts, reflecting different aspects of reality.*

Key words and phrases: cognitive approach; concept; conceptualization; categorization; grammatical and semantic integration.

Cognitive linguistics tries in a new way to solve the problem of language as a form of thinking. According to the American linguist Noam Chomsky, "to know the language ... means to be in a certain mental state" [Cit. after: 9, p. 187]. The scientist puts forward "as the main tasks of theoretical linguistics, the description of language representations in the human brain, that is, those structures

This view is that general cognitive abilities, like our kinesthetic abilities, our visual or sensor motor skills, and above all, our typically human categorization strategies, especially our tendency to construct categories on the basis of prototypical basic-level subcategories or exemplars (Neisser 1987, Rosch 1983, Tsohatzidis 1990) jointly account, together with cultural, contextual and functional parameters, for the main design features of languages and for our ability to learn and use them. The so-called "language faculty" is, thus, claimed to be a

product, or rather a specialization, of general cognitive abilities.

A keyword in cognitive linguistics is embodiment (Johnson 1987, Lakoff 1987, 1993a; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 1999 and their forthcoming book). Mental and linguistic categories cannot be abstract, disembodied or human-independent. Quite the opposite: we construct

and understand our categories on the basis of experience, under the constraints imposed by our bodies. Human conceptual categories, the meanings of words and sentences, of linguistic structures at any level, are not just a combination of a set of universal abstract features, of uninterrupted symbols. A very large number of these meanings and structures are more or less directly motivated by experience, in many cases, by bodily experience.

A cognitive linguistic methodology would take a very different path. One of the basic general cognitive abilities reflected in the structure and use of languages is prototype categorisation: human categories are normally characterized by having one typical member of a category (the prototype), to which other members are related in a motivated way, these less central members departing from the prototype in varying degrees and along various dimensions (see all the references above to the work by Rosch and others).

A cognitive methodology would then identify the prototypical use of eye as that referring to a body-part, and would treat the other uses of this lexeme as motivated non-prototypical senses, related in a systematic way to the prototypical sense. In The eye of the needle and in He has a good eye for beauty the link is metaphorical. The study of polysemy and of the sense networks in

polysemous lexical items thus becomes central in a cognitive approach.

Of course this interest in sense networks or meaning chains is not incompatible with acknowledging the role of abstraction in the mental construction of prototypical senses

Therefore, to cognitive linguistics, concepts, including linguistic concepts, are ultimately grounded in experience (bodily / physical experience, or social / cultural experience). This is thus apparently in conflict with an axiom in twentieth century linguistics: that of the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign.

This insistence on embodiment and motivation explains the important role accorded to linguistic iconicity by cognitive linguists (Haiman, 1985)

Cognitive linguistics brings the concepts of linguistic conceptualization and categorization of the world to the center of attention of modern linguistics. These processes differ: the first allows you to single out the minimum units of human experience (concepts), and the second - to combine the units, characterized as identical, into larger categories. Consideration of these processes as the most important processes of human cognitive activity, consisting in

the understanding and classification of information coming to him and leading to the formation of concepts, categories, as well as conceptual structures, necessitates the study of this process as a multi-level process of knowledge formation. This becomes possible within the framework of the integrative analysis of the subject of knowledge (that is, the subject of thought).

Understanding integration, following NN Boldyrev, "the fusion of simple unities into more complex structural unities" [2, p. 6], it is advisable to consider the subject of cognition as a multidimensional starting point for the process of conceptualization.

It is a complex coordinate system within which the formation of various knowledge takes place. The need for their unification is due to the need to form an integral conceptual system and, therefore, presupposes the integration of all coordinates of the functional representation of the subject of cognition.

Therefore, the goal of cognitive linguistics is to understand how the processes of perception, categorization, classification and understanding of the world are carried out, how knowledge is accumulated, which systems provide various types of information activities. It is language that provides the most natural access to consciousness and thought processes, and not at all because many of the results of mental activity are verbalized, but because "we know about the structures of consciousness only thanks to the language that allows us to report on these structures and describe them in any natural language" [Kubryakova, 1997].

The turning point in the consciousness of many modern linguists came with the emergence of a number of new disciplines that showed the inadequacy of the approach to the language system, ignoring the activity nature of language and its involvement in the processes of human and social life. Psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and linguoculturology were among these disciplines that emerged at the intersection with linguistics.

As a result of such cognitive activity, according to A. L. Sharandin, an integrative unity is created. Integrative unity is a unity created by the interaction of two types of concepts: firstly, associated with knowledge obtained as a result of the reflection of reality, and, secondly, associated with the knowledge of the language system used as a means of cognizing this reality, and with knowledge of the language as an object of reality. Therefore,

integrativity as a result of the integration process presupposes the coordination of linguistic knowledge with knowledge about reality. Moreover, linguistic knowledge is most often determined by real knowledge based on the interaction of lexical and grammatical meanings in the structure of a word [14, p. 51]. Summarizing the above, we consider the integration presented in the language as a process of interaction of mental and linguistic information, based on the unity of lexical and grammatical meanings in the structure of a linguistic unit, which is the result of human creative activity and ensures the functioning of the language as an integral system.

Integration, which is thus of a cognitive nature, at the syntactic level is manifested in the interaction of the lexical meanings of various elements of the sentence, their morphological and syntactic meanings "based on the hierarchy of subordinate links of the verbal predicate" [3, p. 18-19]. The implementation of integration at the lexical level is associated with a linguistic sign as a word that implements one lexical meaning, formed by a set of grammatical forms, the meaning of which corresponds to different conditions of communication and is compatible with the realized lexical meaning of the word [14, p. 52].

Such a two-component structure of a word, one of the components of which is associated with the expression of the lexical meaning, and the other with the grammatical meaning, allows us to speak of the integrative nature of the word, in which "morphological peculiarities are combined with syntactic ones into an organic whole" [4, p. 31], which makes it possible to implement in the communicative act not a word, but only one of the forms of the word, which most closely corresponds to the situation reflected by the statement and is consistent in it with other forms of words.

This is how two different and independent systems interact - lexical and grammatical. Each of them is structured and functional in its own way, which allows them to transmit various types of information through their channels, associated in one case with the reflection of the subject-conceptual side of reality, and in the other with the reflection of language as an independent object of reality. At the same time, in each system (grammatical and lexical), one can observe integrative unity created by the interaction of components in the structure of both lexical and grammatical meanings. In this case, we are talking about the interaction of subject-conceptual and connotative meanings, reflecting

different types of knowledge and their representation in the lexical structure of a word, as well as about the interaction of grammatical meanings, reflecting different linguistic knowledge of a grammatical nature [14, p. 52]. Therefore, it is necessary to highlight the various types of integration within the word.

Grammatical integration reflects the interaction of grammatical meanings presented in the grammatical part of the word, and is due to their conceptual (in) compatibility, which allows integrative processes in the mental (cognitive) activity of a person. Grammatical integration is carried out at the syntagmatic level using the most productive morphological methods, which are suffixation, prefixation, word composition, reduction.

So, the cognitive approach to integration in linguistics allows us to consider a word as a linguistic sign with a multicomponent structure, and to highlight grammatical and semantic integrations that lead to a certain result.

Grammatical integration is the interaction of grammatical components in the composition of a word, carried out on the basis of compatibility or incompatibility of the corresponding concepts, which reflect different aspects of reality. Semantic integration is associated with the process of categorizing concepts, each of which has its own objectification in the language, conveying a certain structure of knowledge. Thus, the study of the language of science in the cognitive aspect makes it possible to understand "not only how a person classifies (conceptualizes or categorizes) the various reality that surrounds him, but also how he rethinks it, and how the linguo-cognitive resources of linguistic consciousness participate in the expression of new meanings and ideas "[10, p. 96].

Thus, having considered the basic concepts of cognitive linguistics, we found out that language, being a mental phenomenon, becomes one of the ways to encode various forms of cognition. It is the linguistic picture of the world that determines the communicative behavior, understanding of the external world and the inner world of a per

REFERENCES:

1. Lee, David. 2002. Cognitive Linguistics: an introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2. Ungerer, Friederich and Schmid, Hans-Jürgen. 1996. An introduction to cognitive linguistics.

3. London: Longman

4. Gak VG About modern French neology // New words and dictionaries of new words. L .: Nauka, 1978.S. 37-52.

5. Karaulov Yu. N. Russian language and language personality. Moscow: Nauka, 1987.264 p.

6. Shoira J. Teacher's Media Competence in The Training Process Eelectronic Informational and Educational Resources //Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT. – 2021. – T. 6. – C. 116-118.

7. TADJIEVA M. Analysis of Concept Love From Contemporary Linguistics Point of View //JournalNX. – T. 6. – №. 10. – C. 410-414.

8. Sharandin A.L. Integration as a cognitive principle of describing a linguistic sign // Principles and methods of cognitive research of language: collection of articles. scientific papers of the Tambov State University named after G.R.Derzhavin. Tambov, 2008.S. 46-56.