COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND FUNDAMENTAL NOTIONS OF CONCEPT

Zokirova Dildoraxon Muydinovna
Andijan State University, Senior Teacher

ANNOTATION

Thisarticle deals with the notions and the history of cognitive linguistics. It studies the scholars who have worked on the concept and cognitive linguistics.

Keywords: concept, cognitive linguistics, language system, fundamental assumptions.

INTODUCTION

Cognitive linguists like other linguists, study language for its own sake; they attempt to describe and account for its systematicity, its structure, the functions it serves and how these functions are realised by the language system. However, an important reason behind why cognitive linguists study language stems from the assumption that language reflects patterns of thought. Therefore, to study language from this perspective is to study patterns of conceptualisation. Language offers a window into cognitive function, providing insights into the nature, structure and organization of thoughts and ideas. The most important way in which cognitive linguistics differs from other approaches to the study of language, then, is that language is assumed to reflect certain fundamental properties and design features of the human mind. As we will see throughout this book, this assumption has far-reaching implications for the scope, methodology and models developed within the cognitive linguistic enterprise. Not least, an important criterion for judging a model of language is whether the model is psychologically plausible.

Cognitive linguistics is a modern school of linguistic thought that originally emerged in the early 1970s out of dissatisfaction with formal approaches to language. Cognitive linguistics is also firmly rooted in the emergence of modern cognitive science in the 1960s and 1970s, particularly in work relating to human categorization, and in earlier traditions such as Gestalt psychology. Early research was dominated in the 1970s and 1980s by a relatively small number of scholars. By the early 1990s, there was a growing proliferation of research in this area, and of researchers who identified themselves as "cognitive linguists".

In 1989/90, the International Cognitive Linguistics Society was established, together with the journal Cognitive Linguistics. In the words of the eminent cognitive linguist Ronald Langacker ([1991] 2002: xv), this "marked the birth of cognitive linguistics as a broadly grounded, self-conscious intellectual movement".

Cognitive linguistics is described as a "movement" or an "enterprise" because it is not a specific theory. Instead, it is an approach that has adopted a common set of guiding principles, assumptions and perspectives which have led to a diverse range of complementary, overlapping (and sometimes competing) theories. For this reason, in this article is concerned with providing a "character sketch" of the most fundamental assumptions and commitments that characterize the enterprise as we see it.

The entire human cognition can be regarded as a developing sense of direction in the world, and this activity is connected with the need to identify and distinguish objects: there are

concepts for operations of this kind. Consequently, the formation of concepts related to the knowledge of the world, with the formation of beliefs about it.

By the end of XX century, linguists have realized that the native speaker — it is a carrier of certain conceptual systems. Concepts are the mental entities. Each concept put together a fundamentally important to the human knowledge of the world and at the same time rejected irrelevant representations. The system of concepts forms a picture of the world (world view, worldview), which reflects the understanding of human reality, its special concept "drawing" on the basis of which a person thinks the world. Explication of the process of conceptualization and content of the concept is only available linguist, who is himself a native of the language. Thus, at the turn of the millennium to the fore in linguistics is a mental problem, because the concepts — mental entities.

The term concept in linguistics old and new at the same time. S. A. Askol'dov — Aleksev published article an in 1928, which named "The concept and the word", but until the mid XX century, the meaning of "concept" is not perceived as a term in the scientific literature .

Now linguistic science can identify three main approaches to the understanding of the concept, based on a common position: the concept — it's what he calls the content of the concept, a synonym of sense.

The first approach, which is represented by J. S. Stepanov, when considering the concept of a greater attention to the cultural aspect of where the culture is understood as a set of concepts and the relationships between them. Consequently, the concept — it's the basic cell culture in the mental world of man. They occupy a position in the nuclear collective linguistic consciousness, but because their research is extremely important.

The second approach is an attraction in Cognitive Linguistics (N. D. Arutyunov and her school, T. V. Bulygina, A. D. Bumblebee and others) the semantics of the linguistic sign is the only means of shaping the content of the concept.

Proponents of the third approach is the D. S. Likhachev, E. S. Kubrjakova and others who believe that the concept did not arise directly from the meaning of the word, but is a result of the collision of the word with personal experiences and the people's rights, i. e. concept is the intermediary between words and reality.

The concept, according to E. S. Kubrjakova — is the operational unit of meaningful memory mental lexicon, the conceptual system of the brain (lingva mentalis), the whole picture of the world, reflected in the human psyche. In the analysis of the concept it considers justified in the use of cognitive linguistics background concepts and figures that are used in psychology to describe the sensory- perceptual processes.

Evans V., Green M. Cognitive linguistics an introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press, 2006. – P. 8–50

Алефиренко Н. Ф. Современные проблемы науки о языке. - М.: Флинта: Наука, 2005, с. 174–19934 European Applied Sciences

According to Kubrjakova if language reflects a particular vision of the world, and it reflects the position of the observer (or conscious abstraction from it) corresponds to the total subjectivity sealed and secured in the language of concepts. However, the synonymy — a phenomenon apparent, because for each alternative token worth individual conceptual framework.

Determining the value of a conceptual framework is, according to ES Kubrjakova, a new approach to the binding of values and knowledge .

Interesting theory concept proposed by Y. D. Apresyanom, it is based on the following assumptions:

1) Each natural language reflects a certain way of perceiving and organizing the world, expressed in him the values add up to a certain uniform system of beliefs, a kind of collective philosophy, which imposed the language of all media;

2) Proper way of conceptualizing the language of the world is partly universal and partly nationally specific;

3) View of the world (the way of conceptualizing) "naive" in the sense that it is different from the scientific world, but it is not primitive notions.

Common to these approaches is the undisputed assertion communication language and culture, the discrepancy is due to different visions of the role of language in the formation of the concept. Objects of the world become "cultural object" only when the concept of ethno-linguistic thinking they are structured in the form of certain "quantum" knowledge of a concept.

This term is still no single definition, although it is firmly established in modern linguistics.

Concept — operational meaningful unit of memory, mental lexicon, conceptual framework and language of the brain, the whole picture of the world, reflected in the human psyche;

concept — a cultural award verbalized sense, presented in terms of a number of expressions of their language implementations that form the corresponding lexical- semantic paradigm, a unit of collective knowledge that has linguistic expression and the marked ethnic and cultural characteristics.

Thus, the concept of the concept comes from the philosophy and logic, but in the last 15 years, it is undergoing a period of updating and rethinking. Different definitions of the concept can highlight the following invariant features: a minimal unit of human experience in its ideal representation, verbalized by the word and having the field structure;

This is the basic unit of processing, storage and transmission of knowledge;

One of the assumptions that cognitive linguists make is that there are common structuring principles that hold across different aspects of language, and that an important function of linguistics is to identify these common principles. In modern linguistics, the study of language is often separated into distinct areas such as phonology (sound), semantics (word and sentence meaning), pragmatics (meaning in discourse context), morphology (word structure) syntax (sentence structure) and so on. This is particularly true of formal approaches: approaches to modeling language that posit explicit mechanical devices or procedures operating on theoretical primitives in order to produce the complete set of linguistic possibilities in a given language. Within formal approaches (such as the Generative Grammar approach developed by Noam Chomsky), it is usually argued that areas such as phonology, semantics and syntax concern significantly different kinds of structuring principles operating over different kinds of primitives. For instance, a syntax 'module' is an area in the mind concerned with structuring words into sentences, whereas a phonology 'module' is concerned with structuring sounds into patterns permitted by the rules of any given language, and by human language in general. This modular view of mind reinforces the idea that modern linguistics is justified in separating the study of language into distinct subdisciplines, not only on grounds of practicality but because

the components of language are wholly distinct and, in terms of organization, incommensurable. Cognitive linguistics acknowledges that it may often be useful, for practical purposes, to treat areas such as syntax, semantics and phonology as being notionally distinct. The study of syntactic organization involves, at least in part, the study of slightly different kinds of cognitive and linguistic phenomena than the study of phonological organization. However, given the "Generalization Commitment", cognitive linguists disagree that the 'modules' or 'subsystems' of language are organized in significantly divergent ways, or indeed that distinct modules or subsystems even exist. Below us briefly consider the properties of three areas of language in order to give an idea of how apparently distinct language components can be seen to share fundamental organizational features. The three areas we will look at are (1) categorization, (2) polysemy and (3) metaphor

In the 1970s the definitional or classical theory of human categorization — so called because it had endured since the time of the ancient Greek philosophers over 2,000 years ago — was finally called into question. The new ideas that contributed most significantly to this development are grouped together under the term prototype theory, which emerged from the research of Eleanor Rosch and her colleagues. In fact, 'Prototype Theory' was less a theory of knowledge representation than a series of findings that provided startling new insights into human categorization. In so far as the findings led to a theory, Rosch proposed in her early work that humans categories not by means of the necessary and sufficient conditions assumed by the classical theory (to which we return below), but with reference to a prototype: a relatively abstract mental representation that assembles the key attributes or features that best represent instances of a given category. The prototype was therefore conceived as a schematic representation of the most salient or central characteristics associated with members of the category in question.

A problem that later emerged was that the view of prototypes as mental representations failed to model the relational knowledge that humans appear to have access to (recall from the last chapter that relational knowledge is one of the properties of encyclopedic knowledge addressed by frame Semantics). These criticisms led to further developments in prototype theory.

Some scholars argued for a revised view of the prototype, suggesting that the mental representation might correspond to an exemplar: a specific category member or "best example" of a category, rather than a schematic group of attributes that characterize the category as a whole.However, these exemplar-based models of knowledge representation were also problematic because they failed to represent the generic information that humans have access to when they use concepts in order to perform a host of conceptual operations, including categorization.

Indeed, the most recent theories of categorization assert that a key aspect of knowledge representation is the dynamic ability to form simulations, an idea that was introduced in the previous chapter. Thus, in a number of respects, prototype theory has been superseded by more recent empirical findings and theories. Despite this, there are a number of reasons why a chapter on categorization in general, and prototype theory in particular, is essential for a thorough understanding of cognitive semantics.

Firstly, an investigation of prototype theory provides a picture of the historical context against which cognitive linguistics emerged as a discipline. The development of prototype theory in the

1970s resonated in important ways with linguists whose research would eventually contribute to defining the field of cognitive semantics. Charles Fillmore and George Lakoff were both members of faculty at the University of California at Berkeley where Eleanor Rosch was also conducting her research, and both were influenced by this new approach to categorization.

For Lakoff in particular, Rosch's discovery that psychological categories did not have clearly definable boundaries but could instead be described as having "fuzzy" boundaries reflected his own views about language: Lakoff thought that lexical and grammatical categories might also be most insightfully conceived as categories with rather fluid membership.

This led Lakoff to apply this new view of psychological categories to linguistic categories (such as word meanings). In this way, "Prototype Theory" inspired some of the early research in cognitive semantics.

Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, although it now seems that prototype theory cannot be straightforwardly interpreted as a theory of knowledge representation, the empirical findings that emerged from this research demand to be accounted for by any theory of categorization.

In other words, the prototype effects or typicality effects that Rosch discovered are psychologically real, even if the early theories of knowledge representation that were proposed to account for these effects have been shown to be problematic. Indeed, a central concern in Lakoff's (1987) book was to address the problems that early prototype theory entailed, and to propose in its place a theory of cognitive models.

Thirdly, as we mentioned above, Lakoff's (1987) book set the scene for the development of three important strands of research within cognitive linguistics: (1) Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Chapter 9); (2) cognitive lexical semantics (Chapter 10); and (3) a cognitive approach to grammar that influenced the well-known constructional approach developed by his student Adele Goldberg (to which we return in Part III of this book).

Finally, Women, Fire and Dangerous Things, despite its rather meandering presentation, in many ways defines the two key commitments of cognitive linguistics: the "Generalisation Commitment" and the "Cognitive Commitment". Lakoff's book took what was then a relatively new set of findings from cognitive psychology and sought to develop a model of language that was compatible with these findings. In attempting to model principles of language in terms of findings from cognitive psychology, Lakoff found himself devising and applying principles that were common both to linguistic and conceptual phenomena, which thus laid important foundations for the cognitive approach to language.

So, for the modern condition of the science typical transition to global consideration of the problems of the themes cognitive linguistics.

Thereby aware and research the ways of conceptualization of world possible, only having possessed by certain set of the knowledge from new scientific paradigm. The Language picture of the world reflects the way of speech restoration to activity typical of one or another epoch, with its spiritual, cultural and national value.

REFERENCE

1. Алефиренко Н. Ф. Современные проблемы науки о языке. — М.: Флинта: Наука, 2005.

2. Апресян Ю. Д. Основы семантики. — М.: 1995.

3. Ашурова Д. У. Cognitive stylistics: view, approaches, perspective. Стилистика тилшуносликнинг замонавий йўналишларида. Илмий-амалий конференция материаллари. Тошкент, 2011.

4. Кубрякова Е. С. Язык и знания. — М.: 2001.

5. Юсупов Ў. Қ. Когнитив лингвистика ҳақида.//Айюб Ғуломов ва ўзбек тилшунослиги масалалари. (Илмий мақолалар тўплами) Т., 2007.

6. Lakoff G. The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Metaphor and Thought. A Ortnoy (ed.), 202–251. Cambridge. Cambridge University press, 1993.

7. Evans V., Bergen V. R. & Zinken J (eds.). The Cognitive Linguistics Reader. London: Equinox, 2007.

8. Evans V., Green M. Cognitive linguistics an introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press, 2006.