



About Concept And Linguocultureme In The Anthropocentric Paradigm

Ziyaev Avazjon *

*Doctor of Philological, Sciences, professor, Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, UZBEKISTAN

<p>Article History</p> <p>Received: Revised: Accepted:</p> <p>CC License CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0</p>	<p>ABSTRACT:</p> <p><i>It is known, the anthropocentric paradigm is a set of ideas that study language not as a dry structure, but as an open system based on living dialogue and communication, analyzing other systems in their integral relationship with people, society, culture, etc .Linguistics, which is considered one of the leading directions of anthropocentric linguistics, arose in the field of linguistics, cultural studies, ethnography, psycholinguistics, and studies the interaction and influence of language with culture, ethnos, and national mentality based on the principles of the anthropocentric paradigm .The object of this field is language and culture, and the subject is language units that show cultural semantics.</i></p> <p><i>In this article the author analyzes the differences between concept, notion and meaning and tries to give information about linguocultureme.</i></p> <p>Keywords and expressions: <i>concept, notion, meaning, conceptualization, categorization, anthropocentric paradigm, cognitive linguists, linguocultreme</i></p>
--	---

Introduction

It is known, in anthropocentric linguistics (paradigm), man is studied within language, and language is studied in terms of man. In other words, in this paradigm, "man" takes the main place, and language is considered as the main element that makes up the human personality. It should be noted that even now language phenomena are being studied within the system-structural paradigm. Textbooks and manuals are being created based on this paradigm. After all, it is natural that the research carried out based on this paradigm will serve as a valuable resource not only for current research, but also for future research based on other paradigms.

N. Mahmudov expresses the following opinion about the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm: "According to such an objective nature of the language, in the anthropocentric paradigm, man is placed in the main place, and language is the main element that makes up the human personality." [10; 6-7]. According to D. Khudoyberganova's recognition, anthropocentric study of the language means showing the national identity of a certain people. According to some linguists, the anthropocentric paradigm has completely set aside the principle of "in and for itself", which arose as a result of the successes of structuralism in the last century [6; 5].

In this, the main attention is paid to the speaker, who is the performer of speech activity and its perceiver. In linguistics, such fields as cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmalinguistics, sociolinguistics, linguoculturology were formed based on the study of the language system from an anthropocentric point of view.

Cognitive linguistics is not only a separate linguistic direction, but also a new scientific paradigm of knowledge, a linguistics that sets new tasks for itself, as well as showing ways to solve problems in linguistic areas related to it.

Great representatives of American and European cognitive linguists such as D. Gerarts, R. Jackendorf, M. Johnson, D. Lakoff, R. Langaker, Ch. Fillmore contributed to the formation of this linguistics. Theoretical ideas of cognitive linguistics in Russian linguistics were developed by E.S. Kubryakova and her followers.

It should be noted that even before the emergence of cognitive sciences, people were interested in knowing the world, the formation of all cognitive sciences began in ancient times and was connected with the ideas of scientists such as Plato and Aristotle about the emergence of knowledge.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, philosophers and psychologists used theoretical and experimental methods to think deeply about cognitive processes and the role of language in understanding the world. The emergence of cognitive linguistics as an independent scientific direction is associated with a symposium organized by René Dirven and other European scientists in the spring of 1989 in Duisberg, Germany. At this symposium, the International Association of Cognitive Linguistics, as well as a decision to publish a journal in this area, will be made.

Thus, the scope of research that interests cognitive linguistics gradually expanded. The formation of the terminological apparatus of cognitive linguistics took place and is taking place primarily under the influence of other sciences, cognitive psychology. That is why linguists have been using cognitive psychology and gestalt-psychology terms with new linguistic content (frame, scenario, script, gestalt, image-scheme, etc.) to express the mental structures manifested through the means of language.

Cognitive linguistics views language as a tool that organizes, processes and delivers information. Naturally, these processes cannot be imagined without the subject of knowledge, the speaker, the owner of the language. That is why cognitive linguistics, which emerged in the second half of the 20th century, was formed as a leading direction in linguistics with an anthropocentric view of language. The study of the linguistic picture of the world, the human factor in language (Rol chelovecheskogo factora v yazyke, 1987), the linguistic personality (Yazykovoy lichnost, Karaulov, 1987) laid the foundation for modern cognitive research.

Now, in contrast to the methods of structural linguistics, different methods, in particular, methods of natural sciences, psychology, neurophysiology, computer linguistics, are being used in the study of language phenomena. Psycholinguistics methodologically created the ground for the transition of linguistics to a cognitive paradigm.

Cognitive linguistics was originally developed in the USA under the name of "cognitive grammar", while in Russia the term "cognitive semantics" was used. N.D.Arutyunova, A.Vezhbitskaya, Yu.S.Stepanov, E.S.Kubryakova, V.N.Teliya also entered cognitive linguistics through semantics.

It is known that cognitive activity begins with a person's direct perception and feeling of reality. Sensual perception prepares the ground for the formation of a symbol of this fragment of reality in thought. In the process of perception of reality, a subject-object relationship arises based on the specific mutual opposition of the performer of cognitive activity - the subject and the object of this activity. All stages of cognitive activity are formed on the basis of the same attitude.

As soon as a person is born, he becomes a participant and observer of events happening in the environment. He understands, analyzes the realities of material existence and compares, compares and observes various objects and processes. As a result, a person absorbs a certain experience, knowledge, assimilates it into his mind, and thus a conceptual picture of the world is formed in his mind, consisting of concepts of different levels of complexity and abstraction.

E.S. Kubryakova writes about the processes of conceptualization and categorization, which are important processes of such an observation: "The process of conceptualization is aimed at dividing the structure of human experience and knowledge into the smallest meaningful units, while the process of categorization is the process of dividing similar and identical units into one another. aimed at differentiating, classifying, and uniting them into relatively larger groups and categories. So, in the process of processing the received information, a person divides existence into parts, objects into classes [7; 93].

Categorization is seen in the language as a grouping of different language units into semantic classes (semantic field, thematic group, (LSG). For example, lexemes of the verb word group such as "action verbs", "status verbs", "speech verbs", "emotional verbs" when we divide into groups, we understand the essence of this phenomenon more deeply.

In addition to the above, it should also be noted that intermediate language units that reflect a set of knowledge and information stored in human memory, such as frame, script, scenario, gestalt, acquired from cognitive psychology, are now among the main concepts of anthropocentric linguistics. In this regard, we

will briefly touch on the explanation of these terms. In particular, the term frame was originally used in psychology and artificial intelligence research.

According to N. Turniyozov, the concept of frame was first used by M. Minsky, and by this he understands the image of certain concepts, objects, events, which exist in human thinking and memory. But this concept is much broader and it can cover even the language system as a whole. In other words, a language system requires a frame system [12; 6-8].

According to the American linguist C. Fillmore, the concept of frame is a cognitive structure, knowledge of which is implied in the content of a concept conditionally expressed by means of words [4; 46]. For example, an airplane frame consists of a set of things like a pilot, a seat belt, and a flight attendant.

The scenario shows the sequence of events and their interrelation, and as its components, the participants of the event, their goals and tasks are determined. A script is seen as a reflection of ideas and concepts in the human mind. Based on laboratory experiments, German psychologists came to the conclusion that it is possible to determine the properties of objects in material existence by imagining new relationships and connections.

This conclusion became the basis for the formation of the science of "gestalt psychology" in psychology. The concept of gestalt represents the German meaning of gestalt (image, structure). This concept was first used by J. Lakoff in linguistics, and this concept is related to the holistic view of reality in the process of cognition and, if there are different parts, to generalize them [8; 614].

A scenario is a sequence of episodes. For example, the script "Visit to a restaurant" includes several episodes: a customer enters a restaurant, chooses a place, sits down, takes a menu, chooses food, calls a waiter.

One of the main concepts of anthropocentric linguistics is the *concept*. It is known that, although the concept has been sufficiently researched in modern linguistics, it still does not have the same definition and classification, because the concept has a complex structure and, in addition to social-psychological-cultural concepts, it contains associations, emotions, values, national images specific to the culture in question. and encompasses connotations as well. Therefore, concepts form a conceptual system and create the possibility of imagining the world in the human mind. Linguistic signs are the main system that encodes existence.

The term concept does not appear in most dictionaries of linguistics. In Russian linguistics, this term was introduced into scientific circulation by philosophers in the first quarter of the 20th century.

According to S. Askoldov, representatives of different nationalities communicate by means of concepts, therefore, creating and perceiving concepts is a two-way communicative process. Such a system existing in the linguistic space determines the uniqueness of the national landscape of existence [2; 267-269].

The term concept is actually from the Latin *conceptus*, which means "concept". This term was used in linguistics as a synonym of the word "concept" until the 80s of the last century, but today it can be seen that its interpretation has expanded compared to the term concept.

According to E.S. Kubryakova, the term "concept" serves as an "umbrella" for the sciences of cognitive psychology, cognitive linguistics, and linguocultural science dealing with problems such as thinking, understanding, data storage and processing [7; 34-47].

Language is one of the means of expressing and forming concepts in the human mind. The concept is the main part of culture in the human mental world. Concepts appear in the human mind not only on the basis of the dictionary meanings of words, but also on the basis of personal and cultural-historical experience of the whole nation.

The richer the experience, the wider the scope of the concept. It is in such a case that the concept can manifest itself in every way. After all, the concept means knowing the world and having an idea about it.

There are three main approaches to understanding the concept in modern linguistics: The first approach to the study of the concept is associated with the name of S. Stepanov, and more attention is paid to the cultural aspect, where a whole culture is a set of concepts and the relationship between them. Therefore, the concept is the main part of culture in the mental world of a person [11; 68].

People imagine concepts as a part of national culture. They occupy a central position in the consciousness of the language community, and therefore their research is very relevant.

The second approach to understanding the concept is associated with the name of N.D. Arutyunova and representatives of her school, in which the semantics of the linguistic sign is the only tool in the structure of the concept.

Supporters of the third approach are D.S. Likhachev, E.S. Kubryakova and others. According to them, the concept is formed directly from the meaning of the word, is closely related to the result of life experiences in human life, and it suggests that the perception of human phenomena in the world has an individual character.

E.S. Kubryakova's opinion that "the concept is the image of the world manifested in the human psyche, the conceptual system of the human mind and the operative meaningful unity of the memory in the mental lexicon" is scientifically justified.

A concept is a form of thinking created in thinking about the most important features of an object determined on the basis of intuition, perception, and imagination. In other words, the image of the object reflected in the mind (its overall perception) is a psychophysiological phenomenon, while the form of the image (object) created on the basis of its important features is a concept. While an image is stored temporarily in memory, a concept is an abstract form intended for long-term storage. The concept that provides the most important and general information about things-subjects is richer and deeper in its content than in meaning. It is known that the concept is formed on the basis of the generalization of objects belonging to a certain class and the set of common and distinguishing features of this object.

In our opinion, the lexical meaning is a phenomenon that exists in the human mind and has a high level of abstraction and generality. In this case, it is defined in explanatory dictionaries. When we speak, the abstract lexical meaning is realized, particularized, and concretized according to the speech conditions and context. In this concretization process, the lexical meaning becomes a concept, and it acquires a logical, discourse status. For example, the meaning of a word that is not included in a sentence (speech) is abstract, the meaning that is in our linguistic memory.

If we take the word "flower" separately, we will come across a linguistic or lexical meaning. When we say "flower", this word only gives a very generalized meaning, that is, "a cultivated plant that gives a person aesthetic pleasure". When this abstract lexical meaning enters a concrete speech or sentence, it acquires extreme specificity and clarity and becomes a concept. In other words, it gives the concept of a flower in a specific state, which exists in nature. We can know the abstractness of the lexical meaning of "flower" from the fact that we say, "Explain the meaning of the word flower, that is, turn it into a concept" to make it concrete. When the meaning of the word flower is explained, it takes the status of a concrete concept and we understand this meaning.

It is known that the laws of thought are related to the objective world. The meaning of the concept does not depend on the nationality, it has a universal character. That is why representatives of different nationalities can easily understand each other and exchange ideas. The word has a national character and is formed based on the specific laws of the national language. Therefore, the meaning of a word does not always correspond to the meaning of a word in another language.

It is not a secret that today all linguists fully understand that the concept is broader than the concept. If the concept and the meaning of the word reflect only the most important features that distinguish the thing-phenomenon from the other, then the concept can also show its insignificant aspects, so the concept applies to a person, a group, a nation, even men, women, young people and old people.

The interpretation of the concept in the fields of cognitive linguistics, linguoculturalology, and also literary studies differs from one another.

Linguistic-cultural concepts differ from cognitive ones by their relationship in a particular culture. Such concepts have a national-cultural character and enter the conceptual sphere of the national language.

N. Mahmudov writes about the study of the concept in linguistic and cultural studies: "In linguistic and cultural studies, a lot of attention is paid to the problems of expression of the concept, when we get acquainted with the Internet materials, for example, in Russian linguistics, it can be seen that this direction is extremely widespread, it is difficult to enumerate the works in this regard [10; 9].

Even in recent years, a large part of the dissertation work has been devoted to the linguistic and cultural research of this or that concept.

The concept as a linguistic and cultural unit represents the specific aspects of the culture of one or another nation. For example, if we pay attention to the concept of "bread", it is reflected in the thinking of Uzbek people in the form of "tandir non, home bread", while in Russians or English people it is imagined in the form of "buhanka or baton" [15; 52-53].

In addition, bread is a symbol of respect for the culture of the Uzbek people, when welcoming "very valuable guests" with bread and salt, putting bread on the table first at home, even taking care of the bread crumbs, if you see bread that has fallen on the floor, pick it up, kiss it and show it to your eyes. Customs such as rubbing, taking a bite of bread in the sense that "provision is staying here" for people who have traveled for a long time, also testify to the sacredness of bread in Uzbeks. Positive meanings can also be observed in expressions and proverbs related to the concept of bread. For example, to eat bread is like zarabatyvat. - After being a teacher, let him conquer the children after eating bread (A. Qahhor, Selected works). To be whole bread - on obespechen vsem neokhodimym. You can't live without bread, you can't talk - Bez khleba ne projivesh a s

razvorovov syt ne budesh. So, for Uzbeks, bread is considered an important standard of food, while for Korean, Japanese, and Chinese peoples, rice is considered the main standard of food instead of bread. Representatives of the lingucultural approach use the term "concept" as well as its analogues "linguculture" and "linguepisteme". When talking about linguculturalology, it should be noted that the language units it studies are a synthesis of language and culture elements. Such language units are also called lingvokulturema in the scientific literature (the term "lingvocultureme" was introduced by V. Vorobev). Linguocultureme is a complex interdisciplinary unit, which manifests the dialectical unity of linguistic and extralinguistic elements [13; 23-45].

According to G'. Hoshimov, the lexemes uncle and aunt expressing kinship in English and their alternatives in Uzbek (toga, amaki, amma, khola) and grandfather-in-law, grandmother-in-law, father-in-law, mother-in-law, Brother-in-law, sister-in-law, in Uzbek language: father-in-law, mother-in-law, mother-in-law, mother-in-law, mother-in-law, daughter-in-law are examples of linguistic culture. In addition, in English lord, toffee, canoe, beefstake, chops, cutlets, cousin, heavens, grandgrandchild and in Uzbek: khoja, tora, eshan, qazi, otakhan, onakhon, akakhan, ukakhan, kelintushdi, kuyuvkachdi, charlar, surpaochdi, khatmi, lexemes such as ehsan, patir, pilaf, atala, nisholda, sumalak, chapon, yaktak, beltbog, doppi are also linguistic cultures [5; 168-172].

The set of knowledge about concepts in human thinking serves to express the sum of the knowledge of the objective existence of the people who speak the language. Therefore, "conceptuality" can be differentiated depending on the level and weight of knowledge acquired by the speakers of the language about objective existence.

We choose the above verbal or non-verbal means and try to use them consciously and purposefully in order to achieve our goals during communication and in the process of dealing with translation, which is one of its forms.

In such processes, our linguality (complex of our linguistic knowledge) and our related linguosphere (the scope of our linguistic knowledge), as well as our underlying conceptuality (complex of our conceptual knowledge) and formed konceptosfera (the scope of our conceptual knowledge) play an important role, because each A verbal language unit or a non-verbal tool has a cognitive basis, that is, it is impossible not to be inextricably linked with this or that concept, because they are specialized for the realization of certain concepts (micro, macro, hyper/super/archy concepts) necessary for communication, and in oral or written speech directly complements one or the other.

The knowledge accumulated by people's conscious perception of existing objects and phenomena and the formation of images in their imagination is formed in different ways in different people and has different character, therefore, it causes the formation of concepts of different structures. In the process of learning a concept, we consider it as a unit of content. Here we interpret the word and the symbols it represents as a multi-meaningful and ambivalent linguistic and cultural unit.

From this point of view, the meaning of the concept is manifested through a number of language-related expressions, lexical-semantic paradigms. That is, the content of the concept consists of language units that are united in one center and form one lexical-semantic field. The lexical units included in this field are closely related to each other according to their meaning.

In this work, the term concept is explained in the following order: "The concept, which is the object of study of cognitive linguistics and linguo-cultural studies, is a comprehensive concept that has ontologically high generalization and the possibility of expression through different levels and means of the language, creating a unique semantic field in each language." The concept concept reflects the interdependence and cooperation of such disciplines as logic, psychology, linguistics and cognitive theory.

More precisely, the concept should be explained by multifaceted, integrative, i.e. logical-linguistic-epistemological term functions.

The concept is a unit of thought, the concept is a logical phenomenon, and the meaning is the essence of the concept and concept.

So, meaning, understanding and concept are different terms. Concept and concept are two parallel terms that belong to different disciplines: concept is a term of logic and philosophy, concept is a term of such disciplines as mathematical logic, cultural studies, linguistics, cognitive linguistics, although they are similar in their internal form. Among these, the concept is comprehensive and includes both understanding and meaning.

It seems that in the anthropocentric paradigm, linguocultural concepts differ from cognitive ones in that they represent relations in a particular culture. Such concepts have a national-cultural character and enter the conceptual sphere of the national language.

Bibliography

1. Anderson J. Cognitive psychology. 5th ed. St. Petersburg, 2002. – P. 164 - 165.
2. Askoldov S.A. Concept and word // Russian literature: Antol. – M., 1997. – P. 267-279.
3. Demyankov V.Z. Notion and concept in fiction and scientific language // Questions of Philology. - Moscow. 2001. No. 1. – P. 35 - 47.
4. Fillmore Ch. Frames and the Semantics of Understanding // Quaderni di semantica. Vol. VI, №2, 1985. – P. 46.
5. Hoshimov G'. M., Hoshimov M., et al. Definition, classification and translation problems of Lingvokulturema //Scientific discussion: problem, solution and achievement. Proceedings of the republic scientific-practical conference. - Tashkent, 2019. - B. 168 - 72.
6. Khudoyberganova D. Anthropocentric interpretation of artistic texts in the Uzbek language. Philol. science. doctor's diss. ... autoref. - Tashkent, 2015. - B. 5.
7. Kubryakova E.S., Demyankov V.Z., Pankrats Yu.G., Luzina L.G. A brief dictionary of cognitive terms. – M.: Education, 1996. – P. 93.
8. Lakoff G. Woman, Fire and Dangerous Things: What categories Reveal about the mind. – Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1987. – 614 p.
9. Lukashevich E.V. Cognitive semantics: evolutionary-prognostic aspect. – M.; Barnaul, 2002. – P. 32.
10. Makhmudov N. Searching for perfect ways to study the language // EXCEED. - Tashkent. 2012. No. 5. – B. 6 - 7.
11. Stepanov Yu. S. In the three-dimensional space of language: Semiotic problems of linguistics, philosophy, art. – M., 1985. – P. 49.
12. Turniyozov N., Turniyozova K. Some comments on the frame and its pragmatic position // Pragmatics of translation. Proceedings of the republic scientific-practical conference. - Samarkand: SamDChTI, 2008. - B. 6-8.
13. Vorobiev V.V. Linguistic and cultural paradigm of personality. – M., Ross. Un - t. Friendship of Peoples, 1996. - P. 23 - 45.
14. Vorkachev S.G. Linguoculturology, linguistic personality, concept: The formation of an anthropological paradigm in linguistics // Philological sciences. 2001. No. 1. – P. 64.
15. Yusupov O'. About the terms meaning, understanding, and lingvokultureme. Stylistics in modern directions of linguistics//Proceedings of scientific and practical conference. - Tashkent. 2011. – B. 52 - 53.