



THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE STUDY OF THE CONCEPT OF THE HEART IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Zokhida O. Amirova

Lecturer, Karshi State University, Karshi, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Although much research has been conducted in the field of concept in recent years, there is no clear understanding of what a concept is and to what category it belongs, nor has a single methodology been developed for their study. Man, the standard of all things, is an attractive object of study for many sciences. Because "the word is the prelude to the whole being", linguistics is at the forefront of such disciplines. While comparing the national and cultural peculiarities of French phraseology with a set of Russian phrases, V.G. Gak also took the word heart to its meaning and explained F.B., and this series of more interesting historical and cultural connotations. stressed that it is associated with z. V.G. Gak notes that the formation of F.B., which contains the word heart in European languages, was influenced by biblical traditions, and that in modern languages it is often combined with emotions, subtleties. In the Bible, it focuses mainly on the correspondence between the concepts of 'intellect' and 'thought' [Gak 1999]. In the history of English culture, the combination of heart power has varied from a symbol of spiritual strength, military courage, perseverance to emotion, a symbol of love.

KEY WORDS: *concept, feeling, emotion, world of emotions, phraseology, intellect, thought, mind.*

INTRODUCTION

In most cases of concept, the concept is divided into "core and external aspects" as a matter of course, but in fact there is no single criterion for this type of separation. Some researchers use the statistical criterion: the most common signs are considered to be central, and the least common - external (Alekseyeva 2003; Yevtushok 2004; Kontrimovich 2005; Stepanova 2004; F. Btissova 2005), but statistical the results of the analysis will largely depend on the visual material and its selection options. Other researchers consider the most stable features that remain in the concept for a certain period of time (concept evolution) as belonging to the core (Bobrova 2005; Yelokhova 2006): they also study the etymological criterion of the word that serves as the concept name.(Stepanov

2004): the core can also be seen as "the most vivid figurative component of the concept" (Karasik, Slisikin 2001; Zvada 2003). One of the central concepts of cognitive linguistics remains to this day much more ambiguous and contradictory, in that the features that different researchers consider to be related to this concept are often mutually exclusive. This concept:

- At the same time, it is a category, a unit and a structure, which at the same time acquires an individual and social character:

- The idea of "abstract, thematic-associative and evaluative features, as well as a comprehensive history of the concept" (Stepanov 2004);

- "is an abstract scientific concept developed on the basis of the concept of life" (Solomnik 1995: 241): "



- "Personal perception and interpretation of the objective essence and concept as the minimum content of meaning" (Likhachyov 1993: 281);

- "memory. Mental vocabulary, the conceptual system and language of the brain, the operational unit of the whole worldview, is the quantum of knowledge" (KSKT 1996: 90);

- "the semantic forms of the concept itself are the essence expressed in the image, concept and symbol" (Kolesov 2004: 19);

- "is a perceptual-cognitive-affective product of an individual nature with a dynamic character that acts objectively in the human mind" (Zalevskaya 2005:624);

- "the operational unit of thinking, the unit of social knowledge that is expressed in language and has ethnocultural identity (leading to higher spiritual values)" (Vorkachyov 2004: 51);

- "specific cultural genes belonging to a culture genotype, multidimensional idealized shaped products with a self-generating integrative functional system based on a concept or false conceptual basis" (Lyapin 1997: 16);

- "any discrete semantic unit (image) of the mind" (Karaulov 1989: 170) and so on.

THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Opinions also differ on the interrelationships and interactions between concepts. However, it should be noted that the mechanisms that provide such links have not yet been described in detail. (Givon 2004). According to L- S. Likhachev, the concepts are interconnected and form conceptual areas that are structurally determined by "man's cultural level, his belonging to a particular community of people, his individuality" (Likhachev 1993: 6).

Thus, if the notion of a concept as a generality, that is, traditional for logic (BSE, 1974), is applied to the concept as a part of the concept, as many researchers think, (Apresyan 2001: Karasik 2002. Kubryakova 1992. Likhachyov 1993. Teliya 1996. Cherneyko 1997 and many other researchers).

If we distinguish between concept and concept, how do they work and how do they relate to each other? The word "pig" has a completely different meaning for an urban citizen who sees the image of a pig in a scientist's pig farm veterinarian only in Dosia brand laundry detergent boxes. For a Muslim who hears the saying "pig is an unclean animal" many times a day, the word has a completely different meaning. The term is relevant not only to Muslims, but also to people who have never seen a live pig, but who liken it to a pig who is dirty and filthy. The non-verbal version of the concept of a pig is the same for all of the above, and the concept of a pig is different. Finally, the question of the ontology of concepts is cross-referenced: how are concepts formed? Two-year-olds can easily recognize the image of a cat drawn with straight lines in a simple picture, and we find that the position of the cat's paws is not four, but three, even if it is hairless or tailless, that is, it is typical of a cat. We know that he is a cat even without any signs (Allakhverdiv 2003). Can we say that we have an understanding of the cat? If so, why can't we explain such a concept, or even imagine a cat as a concept, that is, "a cat in general"?

It is even more difficult to explain the nature of the emergence of abstract concepts: "For example, in experience it is known that no two things are the same. We know that it is impossible to go down the same river twice at the same time, but we still have the concept of equality. If we do not get such concepts in practice, then how do they appear (Gorsky 1961)? Even if we don't actually encounter any potential and actual infinities in our real life, for some reason we can still think seriously about the differences between them. Even Plato was well aware that concepts are not the reflection of anything concrete and, of course, cannot be the case" (Allakhverdiv 2003).

Thus, concepts are formed by language, but we cannot comprehend the process by which they arise: attempts to interpret the concept of life are ineffective: the concept becomes



"logical", that is, it loses its class affiliation. We do not yet have the ability to know (if any) how our minds work with the so-called concepts of life. To claim that a logical concept is a conditional operational unit of thought is a preconceived misconception for completely understandable reasons. Concept cannot be the same in works where semantic and distributive analysis methods are used to study the concept. In general, the definition of a concept understood in cognitive linguistics encourages the observation of hypostasis - the concept has a well-developed structure, is known to be characterized by independent essential features that are prone to evolutionary changes, concepts are self-organizing and self-generating is considered to be capable of mutual interaction within the conceptual field. The consequences of such misunderstandings can be so severe that we are convinced of this in the example of a concept in which an abstract scientific concept tends to hypostasis and is characterized by features of real essence.

In a number of works, the concept is made up of syllables, which in speech are linked to the essence, which consists of certain cognitive features that make up the conceptual content (Sternin, 2004). Such a definition implies the existence of a concept as part of the essence: *sems* (symbols that form the essence or meaning) provide some cognitive features that form the conceptual content, in which case some components of the essence can form the conceptual content, some of which the natural conclusion is that it cannot; that is, conceptual research should describe the semantics that are important to the research and that can form the conceptual content. But what criteria should be used to select them? Articles on cognitive linguistics tend to explore the concept by analyzing the lexical definitions of the word that correspond to it.

If we look up the lexeme of the heart in dictionaries, we can find a number of interpretations, some of which are common to several languages. We can call the most general

characters we get as a result of comparing these annotated dictionaries (the resulting landscape is special: technical, medical and similar dictionaries or indicators can also be compared) by comparing the definition content in the dictionary. the universality of such a concept is more conditional, given that the subject of the horse, the dominant ideology in society, is determined by the experience and views of those who make such comparisons.

Therefore, it is not correct to equate the semantics of a word with the concept that defines the word. In other words, the concept is not as important as it is traditionally understood.

The concept is provided by a complex prototypical representation of interactions at the level of the individual's nervous system: "the interaction of the studied organism with the environment leads to the formation of simple representations. As the number of interactions with similar components in the environment increases, the representation of such interactions becomes more complex ...

As the experience of interaction with the environment increases, simple prototypical representations begin to function only as part of complex prototypical representations. ... if a specific state of activity occurs, then this leads to the activation of the whole complex representation as well. The same thing could have happened if the organism had interacted with the obvious essence that corresponds to this representation ... When we hear the word "smoke" we see it as if we knew it was the smell of smoke. we can imagine and smell the smoke in front of us ..." (Kravchenko 2001: 2005). The close connection between a component of the environment (smell of smoke, its color, opacity) and a sign (a word that is an integral part of the environment, such as smoke) is provided by the state of neuronal activity.

Another question arises: Is it correct to say that this complex representation, which is called a concept, is also activated in the interaction with the sign as an integral part of the complex representation? If the word



LEMON is repeated on its own for a long time and silently, the image of a lemon will inevitably appear in the mind, a sour taste will appear in the mouth, and saliva and gastric juice will begin to separate: the organism is called "lemon". interacts not with the physical essence, but with the representation of interactions that have previously taken place with such an essence.

A sign is any essence or unit, and the interaction with such an essence or unit is able to make changes in the interacting organism due to the experience available in this sign. For example, clouds appearing on the horizon at sunset indicate that many more weathers may be bad. A language sign is a word (sounding or writing) that is culturally pronounced because it is pronounced by a person in this sense. For a one-year-old who has not yet spoken, the words spoken by the people around him are no different from the rattling of a rattle, the footsteps, or the sounds of animals. Linguistically, words are irrelevant to the baby: they are only signs for the baby because the child has not yet had the experience to speak.

It is often said that not only words but also syntactic stretches help to understand the concept. However, in the study of sign interpretation, the relationship between the signifier (word) and the signifier (representation of interactions in the nervous system) is of an experimental nature, that is, it is formed in the process of ontogeny, but in the field of signaling. the formation of the concept becomes artificial. This indicates that it (the concept) belongs only to the field of scientific reasoning.

It is difficult to answer within the existing approaches based not only on linguistics, but also on other disciplines, and some of the questions that cannot be answered at all are: where do the concepts apply, how and at what cost are the connections between them? mined. What is "polyapellation" or "multiple ways of access to a concept" (Karasik, Slishkin 2001: Slishkin 2005: 38), how does the mind work with concepts (Boldirev 2000: 23), why does it

belong to a culture in the minds of different people, different words mean different concepts (Frumkina 1992: 97) and so on - like many other questions, these questions remain unanswered.

So, if a concept is a logically artificial situation, an artificial construct, then for what purpose is it created and modeled? Apparently, a concept, like many other concepts in cognitive science (frame, script, etc.), can also be a tool to help identify and explain the general mechanisms that underlie language interpretation alone. There is no compelling reason to say that the connection between the representation of interactions and the sign is only one-sided, that is, the representative can act as an exponent and vice versa: it depends on what we base it on. Iadi. But neither mathematicians nor physicists are serious about the existence of essences such as vectors, straight lines, spheres, logarithms, derivatives, or integrals, or about their complex structure, relationships, and interactions. The fact that somatic in both languages are more similar in figurative basis is due to the fact that the basic human emotions are universal. The inconsistency between the images of FBs, which are based on a common figurative idea in different languages and represent exactly the same concepts, is explained by the national individuality of the metaphors in the phraseological image, reflecting the worldview and worldviews perceived in the context of English speakers' cultural traditions.

CONCLUSION

Emotions are not in the form of the simplest mental processes based on perceptions and perceptions, but in a slightly different perspective from another class of mental, cultural products, such as happiness and affection. considered. Such feelings fall into the category of socialized emotions and are often expressed through ontological metaphors. For example, the word heart is a symbol of love in the landscapes of the world in which the languages are compared. In English, speakers



compare to something that can be valuable to gain or win (to gain one's heart), to steal to steal one's heart, to lose one's heart to smb. etc. The relative interest of linguists in somatic phraseology is a natural manifestation of the anthropocentric paradigm in social, including linguistic knowledge.

лингвистика. Язык и социальная среда. – Воронеж: Изд-во ВГТУ, 2000. – Вып. 2. – С. 90-102.

REFERENCES

1. Апресян Ю.Д. Дейксис в лексике и грамматике и наивная модель мира // Семиотика и информатика - М., 1986. – Вып. 28. – С. 5-33.
2. Апресян Ю.Д. Образ человека по данным языка: попытка системного описания // ВЯ. -95, -№1, - С. 37-67.
3. Арутюнова Н.Д. Истина: фон и коннотации // Логический анализ языка. Культурные концепты. – М.: Наука, 1991. – С. 21-30.
4. Аскольдов С.А. Концепт и слово // Русская словесность. Антология. М., 1997. – С. 268.
5. Булыгина Т.В., Шмелев А.Д. Концепт долга в поле долженствования // Логический анализ
6. Вежбицкая А. Культурно- обусловленный сценарии и их когнитивный статус // Язык и структура сознания/ Р.М. Фрумкина (отв. ред.). – М.: ИЯ АН СССР. 1990. – С. 63-85.
7. Вежбицкая А. Семантические универсалии описание языков / Пер. с. англ. А.Д. Шмелева, под ред. Т.В. Булыгиной. – М.: Языки русской культуры. 1999. I-XII. – 780 с.
8. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание / Пер. с. англ. Отв. ред. М.А. Кронгауз, вступ. ст. Е.В. Падучевой. – М.: Языкикий словари. -1996. 416 с.
9. Вендина Т.Н. Словообразование и «сокрытие смыслы» языка культуры/. Вестник МГУ. Сер. 19. Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. –М., 2001, - С. 14-31.
10. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык (грамматическое учение о слове). Изд. 2. – М.: Высшая школа, 1972. – 614 с.
11. Воркачев С.Г., Кусов Г.В. Концепт «оскорбление» и его этимологическая память // Теоретическая и прикладная