



LINGUISTIC INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT

Mirzaeva Nargizoy Sandjarovna

Senior teacher of the Department of Social and Economic Sciences
Faculty of Economics and Construction
Andijan Institute of Economics and Construction

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 3 rd February 2023 Accepted: 3 rd March 2023 Published: 6 th March 2023	According to scientists, another basis for distinguishing between linguistic and cultural concepts is that they belong to the field of knowledge and consciousness. Of course, "there is no national science, just as there is no national multiplication table", but there are specific lexical units whose "next meaning" is the substantive basis of the moral, psychological meaning, logical and religious terms - "spiritual values", they are undoubtedly it can be determined ethno-culturally both within the boundaries of one language and within the boundaries of an inter-linguistic scientific paradigm - way of thinking

Keywords: linguistic, cultural

According to scientists, another basis for distinguishing between linguistic and cultural concepts is that they belong to the field of knowledge and consciousness. Of course, "there is no national science, just as there is no national multiplication table", but there are specific lexical units whose "next meaning" is the substantive basis of the moral, psychological meaning, logical and religious terms - "spiritual values", they are undoubtedly it can be determined ethno-culturally both within the boundaries of one language and within the boundaries of an inter-linguistic scientific paradigm - way of thinking.

Hence, there are three main approaches to the linguistic understanding of the concept. First, the number of concepts includes lexemes, the meanings of which form the content of national language consciousness and form a simple image of the world of native speakers, in which the culture of the nation is concentrated. The decisive factor in this approach is the way of conceptualizing the world in lexical semantics, the main research tool is the conceptual model, and with its help, the main components of the concept semantics are separated and stable connections between them are revealed. The number of such concepts includes any lexical unit, in the meaning of which a method (form) of semantic expression is visible.

Secondly, the concept in a narrow sense includes semantic formations defined by linguistic and cultural identity and one way or another describing the carriers of a certain ethnoculture. Such concepts do not make up the entire conceptsphere, but occupy a certain part of it - the conceptual field.

An important structure of organizing and presenting knowledge is the "frame", which was put into

scientific use by G. Bateson in 1955 and considered from a psychological point of view as a way of interpreting the behavior of people. Later, this term began to be used in the works of M. Minsky, an expert in the field of artificial intelligence.

Ch. Fillmore was the first to define a frame in linguistics, defining it as "any system of linguistic choices ... that can be associated with prototypical examples of scenes", in other words, "people associate certain scenes with certain linguistic frames". In the future, the so-called frame theory took a special place in the study of knowledge presentation structures.

According to R. Jackendoff, the meaning of the frame theory gives this opportunity "to fill in the features that are missing in their identification or categorization".

Despite the complex and not very clear relations between the terms "frame", "script", "schema", they all are combined with the general concept of "expectation structures" in the old terminology of K.N.Koza and how a person organizes his knowledge of the world and with them describes how they are used to interpret related new information, events, experiences, and relationships with them.

As we know, it is not always easy to apply frame analysis in practice, because the subjectivism inherent in language and many linguistic research methods are particularly evident here. The psychological basis of the frame theory is related to the concept of expectation. Frame studies are based on the idea that normal human interactions would be impossible if each new event or object were evaluated as unique. People interpret their impressions on the basis of existing experience, on the basis of certain models specific to their culture.



Despite the fact that the terms "text", "frame", "drawing" are often related to each other, some researchers note the differences between them. For example, UL Cheif shows the hierarchical relationship of frame and scheme: when a person encounters an event, he determines it at the level of the scheme, and then builds assumptions about certain participants and their place in this event at the level of the frame, which has a specific expression in sentences.

Speaking about the difference between frame and script, N.F. Alefirenko emphasizes that the script is related to the sequence of events and consists of individual scenes.

Thus, the frame is one of the most important structures for the expression of comprehensive terms and knowledge, but it is not divided arbitrarily, but describes a certain concept. Both frames and concepts belong to cognitive structures, and the issue of their distinction is important in this regard. Researchers say that a frame can be seen as a way of organizing different concepts that differ in levels of complexity. Therefore, the frame itself, in turn, can contain several levels and constituent units.

According to the definition of E.G. Belyaevskaya, the main signs necessary to determine the class in the name of objects are potential signs of a frame logically designed general knowledge, as well as associative signs are defined with other objects of the objective world.

V. N. Telia stated that "the concept is always framed knowledge, that is, it reflects not the essential properties of the object, but everything that has knowledge about the essence in this language collective".

One of the types of frame is cognitotype - mental-linguistic frame. The term cognitotype was introduced by A.G. Baranov. "Cognitotype is a functional unit of textual activity associated with a group of texts in one subject area".

So, all of the above concepts try to answer the question of how all information is structured and systematized in the human mind. The theory of information representation structures is a complex and truly broad area of research currently under the auspices of cognitive science.

On the other hand, the number of limiting concepts includes only those semantic formations whose list is sufficiently limited and which are the key to understanding the national mentality as a unique attitude to the world of its carriers. Metaphysical concepts (soul, truth, freedom, happiness, love, etc.) are spiritual subjects of high or extreme abstraction,

which send spiritual values to the "invisible world", the meaning of which can be revealed only through symbols. A symbol that implies the use of its figurative objective content to express abstract content.

According to Yu.S. Stepanov, such concepts are relatively easily "synonymized" and form a "conceptualized sphere", where semantic associations are established between the metaphysical meanings and phenomena of the objective world, reflected in words, where spiritual and material culture exists.

Means that activate the concept in the process of communication are mainly linguistic signs. There is a linguistic unit (word, phrase, phraseological unit, sentence, etc.) that expresses the concept in the most complete and general form. This unit is used as a concept name. Example: The concept of the "home" is the lexeme of the "home".

USED LITERATURES:

1. Snitko T.N. Limit concepts in Western and Eastern linguistic cultures [Text] / T.N. Snitko. - Pyatigorsk: PGPU, 1999. -S.46 .;
2. Fillmore C. Frames and the semantics of understanding // New in foreign linguistics. Issue XXIII. Cognitive aspects of language. M., 1988.-S. 52-90.
3. Ray Jackendoff Semantics and Cognition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. 1983.pp. 400
4. W.L. Cheif. Linguistic and philosophical analysis of an abstract name. -M., 1997. - S.320.
5. Alefirenko N.F. Concept verbalization problems. -Volgograd, 2003.-S.274.
6. Belyaevskaya E.G. Cognitive foundations for studying the semantics of a word // Structures of Knowledge Representation in Language. M., 1994. -p.87 - 110.
7. Stepanov Yu.S. Constants: Dictionary of Russian Culture. -M.: School "Languages of Russian culture", 1997.-S.824.;
8. Neroznak V.P. From concept to word: to the problem of philological conceptualism // Issues of Philology and Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages. Omsk: Omsk Publishing House. state ped. un-ta, 1998. -p.80-85.
9. Teliya V.N. Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguoculturological aspects. - M., 1996. - P. 228.
10. Baranov A.G. Cognitive Essences as a Basis for Metalinguistic Interpretation // Language and National Images of the World. Mat-ly Intern.



World Bulletin of Social Sciences (WBSS)

Available Online at: <https://www.scholarexpress.net>

Vol. 21, April, 2023

ISSN: 2749-361X

scientific conf. (March 20-21, 2001). Maykop,
ASU, 2001 (b). .-S.147-152.

a. ☎ Tel: +99874 223 49 26

👤 @AndIQI_qabul

✉ E-mail: aiqi@edu.uz

🌐 Sayt: eduaiqi.uz

📍 Manzil: Andijon viloyati, Andijon shaxri,
Navoiy Shox ko'chasi 15-A uy