

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONCEPTUAL AND LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD AND ITS INTERPRETATION

Iminova Shakhnoza-Begim Bakhodirovna

Teacher of the Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Nabidullayeva Sarvinoz Khabibullo kizi

student of group IF-24-1

Annotation: this article analyzes the comparison of qualitative lexemes characteristic of human character, their role in intercultural communication, and functional-semantic properties using the example of the English language.

Keywords: concept, human character, character, lexemes, paradigmatic or syntagmatic field, lexical-semantic field, explicit, implicit, sema

In modern linguistics, the conceptual and linguistic picture of the world is one of the important theoretical concepts that determine the scientific foundations of the relationship between language - thought - culture. Through this picture, it is analyzed how a person perceives existence, how he models it in his mind, and how he expresses this knowledge through language. These scientific views are closely related to the linguocognitive approach put forward by A. P. Babushkin and I. A. Sternin.

According to A. P. Babushkin, a concept is the main cognitive unit of human thinking, which is a model of being reflected in the individual and national consciousness. He interprets the concept as "a set of knowledge formed as a product of spiritual and cultural experience, expressed through language." In his theory, the conceptual field plays an important role - this is a system of linguistic units formed around a concept, semantically and associatively connected. For example, around the concept of "freedom" there is a set of units such as "independence", "responsibility", "choice", "borderlessness", which form the conceptual field.

Sternin, on the other hand, sees the concept as a mental model of human experience and deeply studies how it is expressed through language. He connects conceptual systems with the cultural archetypes, values and the mental structure of the people. According to Sternin, each language creates its own linguocultural model of the world. Therefore, the linguistic landscape is unique for each nation and is the embodiment of the national thinking, value system and cultural experience in language.

The conceptual landscape of the world, as mentioned above, is a mental construct formed in human thinking, organized through concepts, scripts, frames. This landscape is formed on the basis of generalization of real existence in thinking and is based on cultural experience. In this regard, Babushkin interprets the formation of the conceptual landscape as a cognitive sociocultural process.

The linguistic landscape of the world is the expression of these conceptual systems through language. I. A. Sternin notes that language is not only a means of communication, but also a means of transmitting and transmitting cognitive-cultural information. Each language reflects the same conceptual reality in

its own way. For example, the concept of “home” in Uzbek represents a sacred place, family unity and warmth, while in English it is interpreted more as individual freedom and personal territory.

Thus, the views of A. P. Babushkin and I. A. Sternin create a basis for a deep analysis of the conceptual and linguistic landscape of the world. Based on their theoretical approaches, the following main cases are identified in linguistics:

Concept - the basic model of units of thought (Babushkin);

Conceptual field - a set of semantically and culturally related units (Babushkin);

Linguoculturological concepts - integration of culture and language (Sternin);

Linguistic landscape - the expression of conceptual knowledge through the language system (Sternin).

These approaches play an important role in the development of such areas in modern linguistics as cross-cultural research, linguocognitive semantics, and cognitive pragmatics.

The need to develop a generalized analytical model that would integrate different linguistic schools and theoretical concepts and serve as a universal methodological platform for all linguistic levels, in order to conduct a comprehensive scientific study of the language system and linguistic activity, and to deeply analyze their structural and functional characteristics, is a leading one regularly brought to the attention of the scientific community by scientists.

Scientific research on the development of a universal methodology of analysis that allows for a well-founded and objective interpretation of linguistic phenomena is still ongoing. This problem is relevant for modern linguistic research, and the identification of the main methodological concept that serves to form a generalized system of analysis in linguistics is considered an important strategic task for the development of science. In recent years, linguists have been seeking such a conceptual basis within the framework of the complex of cognitive sciences - that is, cognitology (cognitive science). Undoubtedly, linguistic analysis is a special form of cognitive analysis and operates in close connection with the processes of thinking and knowledge. Already at the end of the 19th century, the famous linguist Baudouin de Courtenay emphasized the important role of psychological and social factors in the essence of linguistic phenomena, and justified the fact that the methodological basis of linguistics should be, first of all, psychology, and then sociology, a science that studies social communication and social relations of people. When analyzing the interrelationships between sciences, it is not entirely methodologically justified to consider one scientific field as an auxiliary factor for another. Otherwise, the formation of new scientific directions based on interdisciplinary integration as independent fields would not have been possible. In particular, such disciplines as linguistics, psychology, sociology, and cultural studies are integrally integrated with each other and serve to study scientific phenomena arising on the basis of common cognitive activity. From this point of view, cognitive linguistics occupies an important place in the system of sciences that study human cognitive activity and takes as its object of research the processes of verbal and conceptual representation of thinking through the language system. This term was formed based on the English term “cognitive” (related to knowledge), which has semantic roots such as “cognize” (understand, understand) and

“cognition” (know). Cognitive activity, in turn, is not limited to the process of simple perception and direct understanding. Because empirical observations show that a certain level of analytical and generalizing activity is also manifested in the animal world. Therefore, limiting cognitive activity only to the process of cognition (mental activity, thinking) is not sufficient from a scientific point of view; rather, within the framework of the cognitive process, there is a need to study the cognitatorium - that is, the subject of thinking activity and all the social, cultural and linguistic factors that are inextricably linked to it.

It should be noted that thinking is a product of a person's conscious and goal-oriented cognitive activity, which appears in the communicative environment as an expression of the subject's intellectual and emotional attitude towards reality.

References:

1. Babushkin A.P. (1996). Typic concepts and lexical-phraseological semantic language
2. Baudouin de Courtenay 1963: pp. 217 Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu yazykoznaniyu. Volume 2(s3-48). Voronezh: Voronezh State University.
3. Sternin I.A. (2001). Yazykovoe soznanie i obraz mira (p. 5-52). Voronezh: Izd-vo VGU.
4. Sternin I.A. (2008). Linguistic culture (p. 11-67). M.: Academy.
5. Bakhodirovna, I. S. B. (2023). Semantic-Pragmatic Analysis of Lexical Units Expressing Negative Intellectual Characteristics in English and Uzbek Languages. American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education (2993-2769), 1(9), 202-204.
6. Iminova, S. B. B. (2022). LEXICAL-SEMANTIC FIELD OF UNITS EXPRESSING HUMAN BEHAVIOR IN ENGLISH AND UZBEKISTAN. THE ROLE OF SCIENCE AND CULTURE IN MODERN DEVELOPMENT, 2(24), 8-11.