

## THE CONCEPT OF "CONCEPT" FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF LINGUOCULTUROLOGY

**Makhmudova Gulchekhra Dilshadbekovna**

Andijan State Medical Institute

Department of foreign languages, teacher.

e-mail: [makgmudovagulchekhra1975@gmail.com](mailto:makgmudovagulchekhra1975@gmail.com)

**Annotation:** The concept of "concept" in language culture refers to a special type of knowledge associated with the language and culture of a particular community. The concept is a complex concept that includes linguistic expressions, linked meanings and associations, and cultural norms and values.

**Keywords:** concept, linguistics, terminology, term, language.

The problem of "language and thinking" is one of the most ancient and ambiguous problems of linguistics. The main contradiction of this question lies in the nature of the relationship between language and thinking: does language determine thought or, on the contrary, does thought motivate the generation of words? There are still debates on this topic in linguistics.

We L.S.Vigotsky and S.L. In the study of the problem of thinking advanced by the rubinsteins, we consider two directions. L.S.Vigotsky believes that the historical approach is the key to understanding the psychological nature of thinking. L.S. According to vigotsky, human activity is special phenomena in mental activity, for example, it controls mental processes due to language, signs, concepts, etc. In turn, signs, meanings are a generalized perception of reality, consequently, thinking cannot be distinguished from reality. "...Since the main task of thinking is to know and reflect on reality, naturally, this thinking, calculated outside reality, becomes an act! Sharpas, imagining the imaginary beast, singing in circles, but these are not real meaningful thinking...S.L. According to Rubinstein's concept, thinking is determined by human interaction. However, the object does not directly define thinking, but is determined through the internal laws of mental activity, illuminating the laws of analysis, synthesis, abstraction and generalization. According to his expression, "the process of thinking is at the same time the movement of knowledge in it. It constitutes the substantive side of thinking". The system of thinking develops as a person "Masters the system of scientific knowledge with the logical structure of thought laid in them, reflecting the objective logic of the subject " Conceptual analysis, E.S.Kubryakova noted that although it reveals points of contact with semantic analysis, it has other final goals. If the latter is aimed at explaining the semantic structure of a word, identifying the denotative meaningful and connotative meanings that carry it out, conceptual analysis is concentrated under one sign and the search for general concepts that predetermine the existence of a word, manifests itself as a certain cognitive structure. Semantic analysis is associated with the clarification of the word, conceptual analysis goes to the knowledge of the world. By concepts we understand the images of the content of symbols, units of consciousness that are part of the general conceptual model of the world.

E.S.Kubryakova believes that conceptual analysis of naming can take various forms. For Example, A.Vejbitskaya shows that a typical concrete dictionary can explore the concepts and judgments behind it. Conceptual analysis of the keywords of the period is possible. Using the method of frame semantics, one can try to determine which cognitive structures stand behind certain classes of words.

Finally, E.V.As Clark suggested, classifiers, i.e. words used for the simplest categorization of objects, etc., can be analyzed.

I.A.According to Zimnyaya, as a definition of the content of generalization and reflection of human experience, language "is achieved through human knowledge and personal development, first of all, communication and subject activity. This situation allows us to learn more about the generalized human experience, studying the linguistic and cultural concept of "nature", which also reflects the material and spiritual activities of people, which serve as the basis for our research.

The search for compromise solutions about the relationship between language and thinking is a factor that leads to the denial of their one-sided opposition: "language is reflected as the main means of expressing understanding", and on the other hand, one person categorizes reality through language.

Within the framework of this study, the problems of language and culture in their relationship are also of great interest, which for a long time has fallen into the point of view of many scientists, causing sharp discussions. The problem of linguistic and cultural interdependence is very complex and multidimensional. Currently, several approaches can be distinguished in its solution.

According to the first approach, the relationship between language and culture is a one-way movement. As you know, language reflects reality, and culture is an integral component of this reality. Thus, language is a mirror of culture.

In the second approach, the essence is concluded about the influence of language on culture, Y.Based on the ideas of Sepir, B.It relies on the linguistic relativity hypothesis put forward by Worf in the 1930s. A strong version of this hypothesis is that language affects people's thinking, worldview and behavior. Proponents of the weak version of the linguistic relativity hypothesis believe that there are differences in language, but they are eliminated in speech by description, synonymy and various explanations.We believe that these approaches can be combined.

The third approach can be attributed to reflections on the relationship between language and culture, according to which language is the reality of culture. S, which analyzes the relationship between these two basic concepts.G.Ter-Minasov believes that language is a mirror of culture, it reflects not only the real world that surrounds a person, but also the consciousness of the people, mentality, national character, lifestyle, traditions, customs, morality, value system, attitude, vision of the world. The most important function of language preserves culture and transmits it from generation to generation.

Particular attention should be paid to the problems of national culture, which is usually understood as a set of social relations and values of a particular nation. Each national culture is significant, and each national language represents a identity that distinguishes one culture.

Nowadays, ideas are gaining popularity, according to which the style of" language and thinking " is intertwined. On the one hand, language reflects non-linguistic characteristics that belong to the carriers of Culture; on the other hand, language acquisition, the meaning of the word, from the point

of view proposed by its native language, begins to see the world, and is accompanied by conceptual knowledge of the world inherent in the respective culture.

It is known that directly observed values and attitudes of people, how they think about the world, about life in this world are reflected in the language and are formed at the same time, and the corresponding linguistic units represent “invaluable keys” to understanding these traits of culture. A.Vejbitskaya devoted a number of works to this issue. According to his approach, “any complex concept encoded in any particular linguistic unit of natural languages can be expressed as a specific configuration of elementary meanings that are ambiguous and universal from the semantic Jack”. They are encoded from a lexical Jack in all languages. However, when considering specific linguistic units, a.Vejbitskaya considers it necessary in their interpretation to reflect all the cultural peculiarities of the relevant concept.

We will consider our research taking into account the concept of “nature”, that is, the linguistic features inherent in English, Uzbek and Russian cultures.

For almost the first half of the 20th century, linguistics studied language as a systematic formation of a “simple” view of the world that governs the individual's daily consciousness.

In the future, interest in the problem of worldview has increased significantly, and by the end of the 20th century, there are many works dedicated to the role of language in the formation of the human worldview (G.A.Brutyanyan, G.V.Kolshansky, B.A.Serebrennikov, V.A. Maslova, Y.S.Kubryakova). For Example, G.A.Brutyanyan notes the nature of special interest of all questions related to the philosophical nature of language, the problem of the functioning of language in this process, the reflection of the world in the minds of people. At the same time, the author argues that language activity is manifested only if the result of the reflection of the external world is fixed in the language, accumulated in it and passed on through it to the offspring. This joke is generally recognized. The important thing in this case is that the result of reflecting the reality around us is broken through the prism of language. Hence, knowledge is of a linguistic nature, not only in the practice of language as a way of realization, but also in the fact that it leaves its own mark on language knowledge.

G.V.Kolshansky, when considering the problem of the role of language in the formation of the picture of the world in the mind of a person, first of all, defines the original concept of the “world view”. With this phrase, the author expresses one or another idea of any life phenomena that arise as a result of a person's life experience.

G.V.Kolshansky argues that from a historical point of view, the formation of a vision of the world has acquired sufficient knowledge about the universe from the initial point of knowledge (mythological, simple) scientific side (for example, the state of Science in the 20th century abroad). Knowledge of the world is ultimately determined by its practical skill, while the means of knowing the world is thought. Language is a process in which all reflective activity of thinking in turn is inextricably linked with practical (physical) human activity.

B.A.Serebrennikov also notes the special role of language in shaping the landscape of the world. He believes that language is directly involved in two processes related to the world landscape. First, a linguistic picture of the world is formed at the bottom from the deepest layers of the human world. Secondly, the language itself expresses and reveals other landscapes of the human world, which, through a special means of vocabulary, penetrate into the language and bring the features, culture of humanity. Knowledge of reality through language poses the problem of universal and national –

specific mutonoscience in the linguistic reflection of the world. One of the main features of the national linguistic landscape of the world is the ratio of normative and individual phenomena of the form in which the fundamental categories of the language are expressed in the language.

Y.N. In his works, Karaulov uses the terms "Russian language and linguistic personality" and "associative grammar of the Russian Language", "linguistic personality", and from then on described individual linguistic landscapes of the individual or the entire social group.

V.A. Maslova argues that each language defines the world in its own way, that is, it has a conceptually specific way. In this, it can be concluded that each language has its own picture of the world, and a linguistic person is obliged to organize the content of the word in accordance with this picture. In this world, a person has a special perception, he is fixed in his language. V.A. According to Maslova, the concept of a vision of the world is based on the study of human ideas about the world. If the world is a person and the environment in their relationship, then the image of the world is the result of processing responders about the environment and man. Thus, representatives of cognitive linguistics argue that our conceptual system, the representation of the linguistic landscape of the world, depends on and is directly related to physical and cultural experience.

As scientists talk about the linguistic picture of the world, first of all, that language, as an ideal, objectively existing structure, subjugates and organizes the perception of the world. Second language-a system of pure meanings, which forms its own universe, as if glued to the real world.

E.S. Kubryakova argues that the conceptual and linguistic worldview is related to each other as a whole. Although the linguistic landscape of the world is part of the cultural image, it is of paramount importance. However, the linguistic picture is poorer than the cultural one, since other types of mental activity, along with linguistics, are involved in the creation of the latter, as well as the fact that this sign is always erroneous and based on any feature.

Y.D. Apresyan notes that the study of the simple landscape of the world is carried out in two directions. First, they studied some concepts specific to this language, a type of line connecting settlements with the same linguistic linguistic features, and sets of these features. Secondly, while "simple" but a scientific view of the world, the entire search and reconstruction inherent in the language continues.

Thus, in linguoculturology, language is one of the main concepts - one of the main ways of forming concepts in the human mind. Through the concept, the word enters the linguistic landscape of the universe, in which it interacts with other lexical units. The concept is the central category in the scientific and linguistic description of the linguistic reflection of the world. Concepts developed on the basis of personal and cultural experience, being a spiritual heritage in the minds of people and the result of knowing the world, reflect the image of language and the national mentality.

Professor Khoshimov G'. In his paper, M stated that "similar specific yo universal sema constants can be characterized as concepts specific to cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology, although in this sense it would be more correct to speak of general cognitive linguistics or general linguoculturology, since, on the one hand, their object of analysis is served by precisely these universal concepts and their verbal actualizers, on the other hand, it is, in it, the object of their analysis is private concepts and the private verbal tools that make them realizable [Khoshimov G.M. K aktualnim problemam teorii kontaktov I IX klassifikasii V sovremennoy kognitivnoy linguistike // study of language units in

comparative-typological and linguistic studies and their place in teaching Foreign Languages/ / Collection of articles of the Republican scientific and practical conference. Tashkent, 2017. 44-46-b ].

Therefore, there is no doubt that the concept of “nature”, our object of study, also has its own common (universal) and private (unique) characteristics in the two languages being compared.

### Literature:

1. Выготский, Л. С. Мышление и речь Текст. –В 6 т. Т. 2 /Л. С. Выготский. –М: Педагогика, 1982. Т. 2.–С.34
2. Rubinstein D. The Concept of Action in the Social Sciences / First published: October 1977 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1977.tb00385.x>Citations: 16 /
3. Кубрякова Е. С. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов [Текст]. – М.: Просвещение, 1996. – С.85.
4. Kubryakova Ye.S. Ko‘rsatilgan asar. –М.: Просвещение, 1996. – С.12.
5. Зимняя И.А. Смысловое восприятие текстового сообщения. –М.,1976. –С.27.
6. Ворф В. Лингвистической относительности гипотеза –М.,1956. –С. 267.
7. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. –М.,2000. С. 79-86
8. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство ключевых слов. –М., 2001.–С.287.
9. Брутян Г.А. Язык и картина мира // Научные доклады высшей школы. Философские науки. –М., 1973. № 1.–С.108
10. Колшанский, Г. В. Объективная картина мира в познании и языке Текст. / Г. В. Колшанский. –М.: Наука, 1990.–С.103. <sup>79</sup> Колшанский, Г. В. Объективная картина мира в познании и языке Текст. / Г. В. Колшанский. М.: Наука, 1990. – С.22.
11. Серебренников, Б. А. Роль человеческого фактора в языке Текст. / Б. А. Серебренников. – М.: Наука, 1988. – С.11.
12. Караулов, Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю.Н. Караулов. –М.: Наука, 1987.– С.263.
13. Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика / В.А. Маслова. Минск, 2004.–С.64.
14. Кубрякова Е. С. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов [Текст]. – М.: Просвещение, 1996. – С. 107.
15. Апресян, Ю. Д. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка Текст. В 2 т. Т. 1 / Ю. Д. Апресян. 2 изд.- М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», «Восточная литература» РАН, 1995. -С. 350.
16. Хошимов Г.М. К актуальным проблемам теории концептов и их классификации в современной когнитивной лингвистике// Til birliklarining qiyosiy-tipologik va lingvomadaniyatshunoslik yo‘nalishlaridagi tadqiqi va ularning chet tillarini o‘qitishdagi o‘rni// Respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani maqolalari to‘plami. Toshkent, 2017. 44-46 -b