



Journal Website:
<http://sciencebring.com/index.php/ijasr>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Research Article

THE CONCEPT IN MODERN CONCEPTUAL RESEARCH

Submission Date: July 04, 2023, **Accepted Date:** July 09, 2023,

Published Date: July 14, 2023

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ijasr-03-07-06>

Z.O.Karimova

Teacher JSPU, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article considers the object of research - a mental unit verbalized by various linguistic means (lexical, grammatical) and non-linguistic means-a CONCEPT. The term "concept" in Russian linguistics was borrowed from English literature in the mid-70s. The reason was the problem of adequate translation in the works of foreign authors.

KEYWORDS

Mind, language, culture, frame, knowledge of God, abstract, translation, universality.

INTRODUCTION

Concept is one of the most popular and least unambiguously defined terms of modern linguistics. It is connected, first of all, with the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics and cognitive-pragmatic methodology and is used along with such key concepts as "discourse", "picture of the world", etc., in order to represent the diverse views of the individual reflected in her creations-texts. The term "concept" refers to the

era of medieval conceptualism, the founders of which were T. Gobs, P. Abelard, W. Okam and others. "Conceptualism considered concepts as universals that generalize the signs of things and are created by the mind for its internal use, focusing important and relevant information in itself. P. Abelard considered a concept to be a set of concepts, linking statements into a single point of view on a particular subject, provided the

determining power of reason" [Neretina 1994:119]. The term "concept" in Russian linguistics was borrowed from English literature in the mid-70s. The reason was the problem of adequate translation in the works of foreign authors. Then the English word "concept", derived from Lat. *conceptus* ("concept") was proposed to be translated as "concept". In modern linguistics, the term "concept" is used as a designation of one of the forms of representation of knowledge about the world from the standpoint of cognitive semantics. The concept occupies a central place in a number of other units of the linguistic picture of the world, which include units that are more elementary than the concept, for example, "semantic primitives", indecomposable semantic units that have quite clear lexical correspondences in all languages [Vezhbitskaya 1997 and 2001], and units that are more complex than the concept, for example, frame, stereotype [Krasnykh 2002], "cultural script (script)" [Vezhbitskaya 1997], conceptual bundle [Kryuchkova 2005], cognitive model of the situation [Kustova 2004], myth [Losev 1982; Bart 1989; Rudnev 1997; Levi-Strauss 2001], "precedent text" [Karaulov 1987; Krasnykh 2002].

The concept occupies a middle position among these units and in some sense a central place, because it is responsible for the nominative, subject area of the linguistic picture of the world and for the sphere of abstract concepts [Babushkin 1998; Vorkachev 2001, 2002 and 2005; Radbil 2016]. The concept is also the most convenient unit of the linguistic picture of the

world for analysis, quite definitely distinguished and having a relatively specific expression in the language - "the name of the concept" [Popova, Sternin 2002, 2003 and 2007]. . This unit carries the most valuable differential information about the studied language picture of the world. That is why the concept is today at the center of attraction of a variety of schools and trends in interdisciplinary and anthropo-oriented humanitarian knowledge.

The scientific term of "concept". Nowadays, the concept acts as an object of research in a number of humanities disciplines - in philosophy, sociology, political science, cultural studies, literary studies and linguistics. This is due to the lack of a common understanding of the scope and content of this scientific concept.

So, in cognitive linguistics, the concept is interpreted from the standpoint of interpreting reality in a sign and different interpretations of the sign itself. Attention is focused on the generation of meanings in the text, on the concept in its functioning. The term "concept" in a similar meaning appeared long before the twentieth century. The first holistic doctrine of the concept is the medieval conceptualism of Pierre Abelard. In his interpretation, this concept connects the philosophy of language with the problem of knowledge of God. Pierre Abelard understands the concept as something universal in the subject's speech, which makes possible an "individual breakthrough to God." A person is a person only when he seeks to reunite with God, and does not reside in the society of individuals. The concept provides an opportunity for such a

breakthrough. The concept differs from the concept in that it is not the result of the activity of the mind to study the subject. This is something that does not carry a specific meaning, but rather generates it: "the listener's soul is always elevated while the speech is in the state of utterance, because, this soul believes, something else can join it that will be able to change [something] in [its] understanding. This "something" is the embodiment of a concept that finds meaning only in speech and is formed by speech. It exists "on the other side" of grammar. This is more a potency of meaning than a ready-made meaning: meaning is revealed only in speech. "When we say that a spoken speech signifies something, we do not want it to be understood as if we ascribe to something that does not exist a certain form that we call meaning, but rather we perceive the concept extracted from the spoken speech as a concept of the listener's soul" [Abelard 1992:175].

We meet a similar view of the concept at the beginning of the twentieth century in the philosophy of G.-G. Gadamer, who speaks of the universality of the linguistic sign as one of the main characteristics of language. Language is not a closed sphere of the conscious. Every conversation is internally endless. Translation always limits the universality of the language: interlocutors with different native languages do not properly perceive the potential inner infinity of what is said [Gadamer 1997: 141]. Behind this "potential inner infinity" is the same idea that we find in the philosophy of P. Abelard: the content of a language sign has many components, has many

potential meanings, which are realized and generally can exist only in functioning, in speech.

In modern cognitively oriented conceptology, "a concept is understood as a mental formation that has the character of an established and typical image, performing a substitutive function" [Tokarev 2003: 8]. This understanding goes back to the interpretation of the Russian philosopher S.A. Askold-Alekseev, who in 1928 pointed out that the concept is "a mental formation that replaces us in the process of thought an indefinite set of objects of the same kind" [Askold 1997: 267]. According to L.O. Cherneyko, the concept can be called everything that "is summed up under one sign and determines the existence of the sign as a known cognitive structure, and also constitutes the scope and content of linguistic knowledge" [Cherneyko 1997: 287].

So, the concept contains the concept of a class of phenomena, and besides it - a voluminous associative socio-cultural representation of these phenomena in a generalized form. The concept itself is not a symbolic unit: it is a mental unit verbalized by various linguistic means (lexical, grammatical) and non-linguistic means.

The concept implies a certain unit of meaning, which in reality can only be called a unit. It can be realized in a scientific concept, an everyday concept, a stereotype, a representation, a cultural attitude, an ideologeme. The concept does not have the quality of integers. It is rather a kind of blurred spot of meanings, the boundaries of which are very conditional due to the lack of a single point of view on this object. Heterogeneity

as an essential characteristic of cultural carriers does not allow the concept to have certain boundaries. However, there is always some central representation to which a multitude of meanings that make up the concept should flock. Usually this representation is represented in the language by a specific name, which is considered in linguistics as the name of the concept. The concept can be considered in language and in speech, in synchrony and diachrony, in a descriptive and comparative aspect.

Scientists of the Voronezh School consider the concept as "a complex thinking unit that turns in different directions in the process of mental activity, actualizing its different signs and layers in the process of mental activity; the corresponding signs or layers of the concept may well not have a linguistic designation in a person's native language" [Popova, Sternin 2001: 59].

So, the concept contains the concept of a class of phenomena, and besides it - a voluminous associative socio-cultural representation of these phenomena in a generalized form. The concept itself is not a symbolic unit: it is a mental unit verbalized by various linguistic means (lexical, grammatical) and non-linguistic means.

Concept and definition. To properly understand the concept, it is necessary to distinguish it from the related term "definition". In the "Great Encyclopedic Dictionary" it is proposed to understand the concept as "the semantic meaning of the name (sign), i.e. the content of the concept, the scope of which is the subject (denotation) of this name" [LES 1993: 568]. In the lexicographic

source "Linguistics. The Big encyclopedic dictionary" the concept and the concept, in fact, do not differ: "The concept (concept) is a phenomenon of the same order as the meaning of the word, but considered in a slightly different system of connections; meaning is in the system of language, the concept is in the system of logical relations and forms studied both in linguistics and logic" [YBES 1998: 384]. The terms concept and concept are often confused, obviously, because this distinction is not significant for every branch of science.

In the study of M.R. Proskuryakova and L.D. Bugaeva, it is proposed to define the concept through the scope and content of the concept, and in the procedural aspect: "The most promising for the analysis of the conceptual structure of the text is the definition of the concept as a cycle of the concept, involving the process — filling the content of the concept with "knowledge of the essence" and its result — the scope of the concept. Thus, the concept appears as a tense, energetic convention of the scope and content of the concept" [Proskuryakov, Bugaeva 2001: 22].

In L.O. Cherneyko's work, the concept and the concept are contrasted as a sublogical and rational, logical phenomenon: "The content of the concept includes the content of the naive concept, but is not exhausted by it, since it covers all the many pragmatic elements of the name, manifested in its compatibility. And the compatibility of the name reflects both the logical, rational connections of its designation (denotation) with others, and illogical, irrational, reflecting the emotional and evaluative

perception of the world by a person" [Cherneyko 1997: 287].

G.V. Tokarev believes that concepts are representations that differ from concepts by the presence of differential features, which are "firstly, their pre-scientific (naive) nature, fuzzy extensional, variable intensional, which leads ... to the fact that concepts explain what is happening, representations are not; secondly, international character the first and idioethnic - the second" [Tokarev 2003: 33].

Thus, a concept is a representation, not a concept, so a concept can have such properties as imagery, expressiveness, non-rigidity of semantics, etc.

Based on the above, the scientific concept of "concept" can be given the following working definition:

-- a hierarchically organized linguistic-mental-cultural phenomenon acting as a unit of the linguistic picture of the world and embodied in a combination of multi-level linguistic and speech means.

The concept of "homeland" is one of the key concepts of culture, the universal value of the concept of "homeland" is reflected in the works of A. Vezhbitskaya, I. Sandomirskaya, V. N. Telia, S. G. Ter-Minasova, S. G. Vorkachev, whose research has shown that "homeland" is a universal value. The national image of any country is a diverse conceptual sphere, including various concepts (peace, love, homeland, kindness, nation, etc.). In the conceptual sphere of the "national image of Russia", the concept of "motherland" occupies a

key place in the Russian language picture of the world and represents the unity of linguistic and cultural content. Russian concept "motherland" is one of the most important in the Russian national consciousness, is included in the list of "1000 most used 13 Russian words" and is on a par with such moral categories as kindness, love, friendship, patriotism, freedom and will.

According to researchers such as N. A. Berdyaev, Yu. S. Stepanov, D. S. Likhachev, S. G. Vorkachev, V. N. Telia), the attachment of Russians to "their" space, to the place of their birth is so emotionally colored that it allows us to talk about the axiological value of this conceptual feature. Another nuclear meaning of the concept of homeland, recorded in the explanatory dictionaries of D. N. Ushakov, S. I. Ozhegov and some others, is "the country in which a person was born and of which he is a citizen", "fatherland", "native country", "state". This conceptual feature is accordingly actualized in speech in the meaning of 'big motherland'. In modern Russian discourse, the interpretation of the concept of "homeland" is broad and diverse, creating a polyphonism of assessments and interpretations of its content in the minds of native speakers of the Russian language.

REFERENCES

1. Larionova 2011 -- Larionova, D.G. National-cultural specificity of the conceptualized area "patria" and its account in teaching Russian to American students: Dis. ... Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences: 13.00.02 [Text] / D.G.

- Larionova; A.I. Herzen State Pedagogical University. -- St. Petersburg, 2011. -- 280 p.
2. Leontiev 1997 -- Leontiev, A.A. Fundamentals of psycholinguistics: Textbook [Text] / A.A. Leontiev. -- M.: Sense, 1997. -- 287 p.
3. Likhachev 1987 -- Likhachev, D.S. Notes on Russian [Text] / D.S. Likhachev // D.S. Likhachev. Selected works in 3 volumes -- L: Fiction, 1987. -- Vol. II. -- 493 p.
4. Likhachev 1997 -- Likhachev, D.S. Conceptosphere of the Russian language [Text] / D.S. Likhachev // Russian Literature. From the theory of literature to the structure of the text: An Anthology. -- Moscow: Academia, 1997. -- pp. 280-287.
5. Losev 1982 -- Losev, A.F. Sign. Symbol. Myth: Works on Linguistics [Text] / A.F. Losev. -- Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1982. -- 480 p.
6. Lotman, Uspensky 1971 -- Lotman, Yu.M. On the semiotic mechanism of culture [Text] / Yu.M. Lotman, B.M. Uspensky // Works on sign systems: Scientific notes of the Tartu State University. Issue V. 284. -- Tartu: TSU, 1971. -- pp. 144-167.
7. Lyapin 1997 -- Lyapin, S.H. Conceptology: Towards the formation of an approach [Text] / S.H. Lyapin // Concepts. Scientific works of Centroconcept. Issue 2. -- Arkhangelsk, 1997. -- pp. 11-35.
8. Maslova 2001 -- Maslova, V.A. Linguoculturology. Textbook [Text] / V.A. Maslova. -- M.: Academia, 2001. -- 202 p.
9. Maslova 2006 -- Maslova, V.A. Introduction to cognitive linguistics: Textbook [Text] / V.A. Maslova. -- Moscow: Flint, Nauka, 2006. -- 294 p.
10. Teaching methods 2019 -- Teaching methods of Russian as a foreign language: a textbook for universities [Text] / I.P. Lysakova, G.M. Vasilyeva, S.A. Vishnyakova, etc.; edited by Prof. I.P. Lysakova. - 3rd ed., stereotype. -- M.: Russian language. Courses, 2019. -- 320 p.
11. Mechkovskaya 2004 -- Mechkovskaya, N.B. Semiotics: Language. Nature. Culture: Course of lectures [Text] / N.B. Mechkovskaya. -- M.: Publishing Center "Academy", 2004. -- 432 p.