Problems of Linguvognitive Learning of the Uzbek Language

Usmanova Oyistakhon Yuldashalievna[1], Rakhimova Firuza Shavkatovna[2],

Saidnomonov Akmalkhoja Komiljonovich[3], Akbarova Dilorom Akhatovna[4]

[1] Tashkent State Technical University, Associate Professor, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences.
[2] Tashkent State Technical University, senior teacher.
[3] the Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan
[4] Uzbek State University of World Languages

Abstract

Today, despite the urgency of some of the minor problems of linguistics, the existing scientific potential is not focused on solving important problems, and the main tasks that determine the future of the industry are still off the agenda. Therefore, this article deals with the current problems of Uzbek linguistics, which need to be addressed in the new century.

Keywords: anthropocentric paradigm, cognitive-semantic research, anthropocentrism, linguoculturology, anthropocentric tendencies, metaphor, metonymy, analogy, and anthropocentric linguistics

Introduction

It is well known that in world linguistics the text is initially approached mainly from a semantic and syntactic point of view. In recent years, especially since the beginning of the XXI century, the tendency to study the text on the basis of linguacultural, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, cognitive and psycholinguistic principles have increased. It began to be seen not only as a collection of semantically and syntactically related sentences, but also as a socially valuable form of communication, a mental device that reflected the knowledge, linguistic thinking, national psychology, and mentality of certain speakers.

The formation of the anthropocentric paradigm is associated with the study of the language-speaking factor. The emergence of an anthropocentric shift in linguistics has shifted the focus of structuralism from the principle of 'in and of itself' to the study of language, focusing on the personality factor.[1]

Method

The roots of anthropocentrism, which is now recognized as one of the leading paradigms of linguistics, have been nourished by the theoretical views of W. von Humboldt and L. Weisgerber.[2]

The word anthropocentrism is a combination of the Greek words anthropos - man and Latin centrum - center.[3]

The term anthropocentrism was originally used to refer to the ancient Greek philosophy's view that man is the center of the universe, a practice that was especially prevalent in medieval Europe.[4]

In linguistics, the study of the language system from an anthropocentric point of view has been reflected mainly in studies of linguistic semantics, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatic linguistics, and linguoculturology. Based on the anthropocentric paradigm, the language system has been studied in relation to the personality factor. Although the research of Uzbek linguists on linguistic semantics, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics shows anthropocentric tendencies, the research in this area is still insufficient.

It should be noted that in Uzbek linguistics there is a certain research on the linguopoetic, pragmatic, derivational, communicative features of the text. However, texts written in Uzbek have not been studied in an anthropocentric way.

The emergence and development of such fields in world linguistics as pragmalinguistics, discursive analysis, cognitive linguistics, and linguoculturology have led to the emergence of serious theoretical views in the interpretation of the phenomenon of text creation. In particular, the anthropocentric approach to text analysis has become one of the leading areas of modern linguistics. Many researchers have argued that in textual research, which is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, the trinity of speaker-text-listener (author of the text-text-recipient) should be the main object.[5]

Well-known Russian linguist Y.N. Karaulov, in his foreword to a collection of articles on language and personality, emphasized that "behind any text is a certain person who possesses a linguistic system."[6] Indeed, the most important source in illuminating the relationship between language and personality is the text. Because it is not only a speech structure that unites all levels of language, but also a phenomenon that fully reflects the linguistic potential of the speaker (writer). The external and internal structure of a text can be likened to a mirror that reflects the linguistic abilities of speakers of a particular ethnic group.

While the focus on the person who created the text was originally seen in research in psycholinguistics and pragmalinguistics, the rapidly evolving fields of cognitive linguistics, functionalism, ethnolinguistics, linguoculturology, and discursive analysis make this one of the central problems of linguistics. turned.

Prof. Sh. Safarov explains the emergence of the anthropocentric paradigm as follows: took the path of doing. The main effect of the system-structural approach is to prove that language is a systemic phenomenon. But it also became clear that these two paradigms had one thing in common: in these areas, language was separated from its owner, man. Efforts to address this have led to the creation of pragmatic and cognitive linguistic paradigms."[7]

Prof. Commenting on the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics, N. Mahmudov states: Experts quote the well-known Russian writer S. Dovlatov, who said that "90% of the human personality is language." As VA Maslova points out, the human mind cannot be imagined without man himself, language and the ability to create speech and perceive speech."[8]

Today, the study of the personality factor as a linguist is deepening in the above-mentioned areas of linguistics - psycholinguistics, linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics. At the same time, the anthropocentric approach to language embodies the latest achievements in these areas and strengthens its status as an independent paradigm.

As recognized in linguistics, the anthropocentric paradigm focuses on the performer of speech activity, that is, the speaker who composes and understands speech.[9] It should be noted that the introduction of the category of "speaker" in the scientific paradigm requires the further activation of such concepts in linguistics as personality, linguistic consciousness, thinking, activity, mentality, culture.[10] The study of the personality factor also leads to the intersection of linguistics with sciences such as psychology, philosophy, logic, and cultural studies.

The term "linguist" is now used in the following senses: a) a person who performs a speech activity in a particular language, that is, a person who has the ability to compose and comprehend speech; b) a person who uses language as a means of communication, a communicator; c) a person who has a dictionary that reflects the national, cultural and spiritual values of his nation; representative of a particular language.[11] In current research, different areas of linguistics approach the issue of the personality factor from their own perspective.

The problem of text interpretation and the personality factor is inextricably linked with the problems of text creation and its semantic perception. In researching this issue, it is important to study not only the person who created the text, but also the person who perceives it - the listener or the reader. According to the Russian linguist R.I. Galperin, a text written on paper that has not yet been read is motionless.[12] In particular, the written text does not move until it is read by the reader, the content and pragmatic purpose expressed in it, the mood created by the tone is not understood and felt by the recipient.

The study of the text and the personality factor that perceives it requires an approach to the object of study from various perspectives, including semantic, psychological, pragmatic, cognitive, and lingvoculturological perspectives.

In the words of N.I. Jinkin, "Man speaks through text, not individual words."[13] Therefore, the expected results can be achieved only if the style of a particular person is studied on the basis of the texts he created. The way in which a writer or author's style of speech is studied in terms of his or her use of words or sentence structure does not meet today's requirements. Therefore, studying the issue of text creation from the point of view of personality style leads to a deeper look at the linguistic aspects of the text.

As you know, cognitology is inextricably linked to semantics. According to A.V. Kravchenko, "... cognitive linguistics is the main task of studying the mechanisms of storage, expression and transmission of knowledge through language."[14] The study of the linguocognitive features of the language of a particular creative person, based on the rich theoretical data created in world linguistics, is also important in illuminating the "grammar of thinking" of Uzbek speakers.

The study of a person's cognitive activity in the creation of a text also serves to shed more light on the way of thinking inherent in the Uzbek mentality. Because the conceptual idea in the text can sometimes be ethnic in nature.[15] By studying the process of text creation, it is possible to analyze the stages of linguistic formation of universal subject codes, noted by N.I. Jinkin.[16] Consequently, the study of the linguocognitive features of a particular person's speech also allows for the illumination of many dark and mysterious "areas" of the mechanism of the creation of artistic speech, which in many cases manifest implications.

Many researchers today consider the 21st century to be a century of science integration. Interdisciplinary collaboration is yielding results in illuminating the nature of a particular object. The best way to use this approach is to study the speech activity of a complex human phenomenon. Because human speech is as complex and multifaceted as it is. There is no doubt that cooperation in the field of linguistics will pay off.

It should be noted that in the early years of the XXI century in Uzbek linguistics conducted serious research in the field of text linguistics: text linguopoetics, semantic perception, its pragmatic, derivational and psycholinguistic features, text modality and work in the monographic aspect about temporality.

In the words of linguist N.A. Arutyunova, "... a type of goal-oriented social activity, speech that participates in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes); The study of the problem of "text in relation to reality"[17] and the interaction of the activities of a person with a linguistic mind is important in defining the principles of anthropocentric analysis in Uzbek linguistics. Also, the study of a text in terms of its origin, comprehension, and comprehension deepens the theoretical views of the text. The study of the mechanisms of the process of entering the textual form of the intellect and way of thinking of a person with a discursive activity, allows to identify the features of the Uzbek model of thinking models. In our opinion, the analysis of a literary text, which is one of the types of text according to the style of speech, can provide rich material for Uzbek linguistics.

Discussion

Many researchers agree that cognitive linguistics and lingvoculturology are the leading areas of the anthropocentric paradigm.[18] While acknowledging this view, we are in favor of promoting the idea that the field of psycholinguistics should be included in this category. After all, cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology intersect at many points with psycholinguistics.[19] It should also be noted that the literary text under study is directly related to psycholinguistic factors. According to the authors of the book "Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics" IN Gorelov, KF Sedov, psycholinguistics is the core of the anthropocentric direction in linguistics. Therefore, the main goal of this study is to study Uzbek texts on three aspects: cognitive-semantic, psycholinguistic and linguocultural. Prose and poetic texts in the Uzbek language, created in an artistic style, were selected as the object of research. Cognitive-semantic, psycholinguistic and linguocultural features of Uzbek texts are the subject of research.

It should be noted that it is not possible to study in detail all aspects of the Uzbek language texts in one dissertation related to the person and the ethnos to which he belongs. We believe that anthropocentric analysis of the text is not limited to this study. There is no doubt that more research will be done in Uzbek linguistics.

Concerning the content of this paragraph, that is, the problems of cognitive-semantic study of the text, it should be noted that cognitive linguistics, which took its first steps in the last quarter of the last century, is one of the leading fields of linguistics in the early XXI century. has become one. Currently, there are several directions in this field.

Cognitive linguistics is the study of language as a general cognitive mechanism. According to V.Z. Demyankov, the role of the language system in the processing of information is studied in terms of speech creation and comprehension. In this case, the subjects that create and perceive speech - the speaker and the listener - are considered as a system of information processing.[20]

Cognitive linguistics is inextricably linked with the concept of cognitive activity. Cognitive activity is the process of thinking that makes a person perceive something or reality.[21]

The concept of cognition is also a central concept in cognitive linguistics, which is interpreted in the scientific literature as a system of processes such as the perception, coding, and creation of information.[22]

The concept is the most widely used term in cognitive linguistics and has a variety of definitions. His interpretations of cognitive linguistics, linguoculturology, and literature differ. While the term was used in linguistics as a synonym for the word concept until the 1980s, its current interpretation has a broader meaning than the term concept.[23] In particular, N.Yu. Shvedova said that the concept is a concept,[24] and behind this concept is a social or subjective understanding, reflecting the important material, mental, spiritual aspects of human life, having its own historical roots, the general experience of the people. notes the presence of reflective content.[25]

Prof. In one of his articles, N.Mahmudov noted that the term concept is the term with the most definitions: it can be seen that in linguistics this line is so widespread that it is even more difficult to enumerate and enumerate the works in this field. Even a large number of dissertations defended in recent years have been devoted to the linguocultural study of the concept in one language or another."[26]

Russian linguist L.V. Adonina, in his article on the term concept, gives 12 definitions of the term mentioned by well-known linguists. According to him, the term concept is classified into ten points. For example, universal, ethnic, group, and individual concepts according to concept standardization; scientific, artistic, everyday concepts according to their application; lexical-phraseological, grammatical, syntactic and textual concepts according to their expression, etc.[27]

In our study, we have chosen Y.N. Shvedova's definition of the concept as a basis.[28]

Opinions on the term concept are explained in detail by Uzbek linguists N.Mahmudov, Sh.Safarov and A.E. Mamatov. Therefore, we prefer to limit ourselves to our views on the concept. In our opinion, a concept is, in fact, a mental structure. But it is a multifaceted, multi-layered structure. The concept also reflects psychological, cognitive-semantic and linguocultural aspects at the same time. This is evidenced by the fact that the concept is described as an object of cognitive, psycholinguistic and lingvoculturological research. We also consider the fact that the concept is divided into types as subjective, social, linguocultural, artistic concepts as an approach to a single essence from different angles. After all, the language system itself is one of the most multifaceted phenomena that combines the above qualities.

Linguistic conceptualization is important in cognitive linguistics. Linguistic conceptualization is the expression of an objective reality or part of it through language. He said that "... it is a verbalized form of the meanings accumulated in the human mind and a systematization of knowledge about the world through a specific language, which is partly universal and partly national in nature."[29]

The importance of cognitive metaphors in cognitive activity is immeasurable. J. Lakoff, one of the founders of cognitive linguistics, in his research deeply argued that metaphor is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but also an important tool in human cognitive activity. From the point of view of cognitive science, cognitive metaphor is one of the ways in which a person expresses and conceptualizes his knowledge, the essence of which is to understand and explain one object through another object.[30]

Despite the fact that there is a lot of research on metaphors in world linguistics,[31] this phenomenon is increasingly attracting linguists. In particular, the formation of the fields of linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics requires a deeper study of metaphors, as well as metaphorical texts in the study of this phenomenon.

Among the views that interpret the personality factor as one of the key factors, the cognitive interpretation of text creation is noteworthy. Cognitive interpretation approaches the creation of text on the principle of "author - text - extra-textual reality" and promotes the idea of looking at it from several points of view at the same time. For example, a text that expresses the speaker's purpose, a text that is the product of speech, a text that is the object of comprehension, a text that is the product of comprehension.

According to the cognitive interpretation of text creation, text is a linguistic transformation of mental structure. It is clear from this interpretation that the future text in the inner discourse is seen not as a set of successive propositions, but as a whole form moving from the whole to the parts. It is known that in linguistics it is recognized that a text has an external (lexical-grammatical) and internal (semantic) structure. The internal structure of the text is a semantic concentrate, a core content. The task of the cognitive linguist is to identify the mental structures that underlie this content.

According to V.Z. Demyankov, one of the representatives of cognitive linguistics, depending on the chosen communicative strategy, the same information can be expressed differently in different situations. There can be a big difference between the organized information in a person's memory and its verbal form. Text creation modules include information generators and articulators. Speech, in particular, the creation of a text, obeys not only the semantic and grammatical laws, but also the specific rules of expression of information. Event narrative schemes vary, and the text is based on the interrelationships of these events.

In the process of creating a speech, the speaker changes his speech depending on the reaction of the listener. It should be noted that the planning of the speech and its implementation take place almost simultaneously. One does not always know in advance how one's speech will be expressed, because one sentence or word requires the utterance of another sentence or word. According to cognitivists, this

process is controlled by a grammar monitor. During text creation, the individual uses ready-made linguistic units as well as nomination strategies. Typically, the process of creating a text is defined by two stages: planning the writing of the text (organizing the conceptual content); text generation (transformation into natural language).

One of the most common methods in cognitive linguistics today is frame analysis. According to linguocognitology, any text is an expression of a certain frame. One of the scientists who developed the frame theory, M. Minsky, describes it as follows: "... a frame is a way of expressing stereotypical situations, in which any frame is interconnected multifaceted information." Consequently, a frame is a large-scale prototype of a typical situation and serves as a cognitive context in the process of text creation. It should be noted that gestalt, one of the cognitive structures, also plays an important role in the study of text creation. The theory of semantic gestalties, which exists in modern linguistics, has been applied to the study of the lexical level of language. There are very few studies that link the Gestalt phenomenon to text. However, the creation of any text reflects the process of "whole-to-part". Prof. According to Safarov, the study of Gestalt and text creation is one of the most important issues.

Conclusion

From a psycholinguistic point of view, the creation of a text and its semantic perception is the product of an individual's verbal thinking, the ability to express an objective being through a system of language. In this case, the form and content of the text is studied in conjunction with the psychological characteristics of a particular communicative situation participant – a specific person.

At this point, the question naturally arises: what does the study of this process of thinking give to linguistics? In our opinion, the following words of ES Kubryakova can be a very appropriate answer to this question: "Any linguistic phenomenon can be considered appropriately described and explained only if it is studied at the intersection of cognition and communication."[32] After all, one of the main goals of linguocognitology is to study language as a system of information transmission and perception.

Cognitive metaphors leave their mark on a word, phrase, sentence, or text as one of the factors that cause implication. The metaphorical units are the surface of the "cognitive iceberg" (the Faconier phrase), the main part of which is hidden in the depths of our linguistic consciousness. It should be noted that the phenomenon of cognitive background, which reflects the above, has not yet been the subject of research in Uzbek linguistics. The study of cognitive background phenomena in relation to phenomena such as metaphor, metonymy, analogy, and animation is one of the essential problems of anthropocentric linguistics.

REFERENCES

Vorkachev S.G. Linguoculturology, linguistic personality, concept: the formation of an anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics // Philological sciences. - Moscow, 2001. - No. 1. - P. 64.

See: Maslova V.A. Linguoculturology. - M .: Academia, 2001. - p. 17; Mahmudov N. Looking for ways to study the language perfectly ... // Uzbek language and literature. - Tashkent, 2012. - № 5. - B. 3-16; Pimenova M.V., Kondrateva O.N. Conceptual research. Introduction. - M .: Flinta, 2014. - p. 8.

http // ph.ras.ru// elib 0215 html: Novaya filosofskaya encyclopedia.

Pimenova M.V., Kondrateva O.N. The work shown. - B. 8.

Kubryakova E.S. About the text and the criteria for its definition // Text. Structure and semantics. - M., 2001. - Vol. 1. - S. 72-81.

Yu.N. Karaulov Russian linguistic personality and the task of its study // Language and personality. - M .: Nauka, 1989 .-- S. 3-8.

Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. - Tashkent: "National encyclopedia of Uzbekistan", 2008. - B. 35.

Mahmudov N. Looking for ways to study the language perfectly ... // Uzbek language and literature. - Tashkent, 2012. - № 5. - B. 6-7.

Vorkachev S.T. Linguoculturology, linguistic personality, concept: the formation of an anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics // Philological sciences. - Moscow, 2001. - No. 1. - P. 64.

Sedov K.F. Discourse and personality. - M .: Labyrinth, 2004 .-- P. 5.

Vorkachev S.T. Shown article. - B. 8-11.

Galperin R.I. On the concept of text // Questions of linguistics. - Moscow, 1974. - No. 6. - p.22.

Zhinkin N.I. Speech as a conductor of information. - M .: Nauka, 1982 .-- P. 108.

Kravchenko A.V. Sign, meaning, knowledge. Essay on the cognitive philosophy of language. - Irkutsk: ISU, 2001. - No. 1. - P.60.

Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. - Tashkent: "National encyclopedia of Uzbekistan", 2008. - B. 245.

Zhinkin N.I. Speech as a conductor of information. - M .: Nauka, 1982.-157s.

Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. - M .: Soviet encyclopedia, 1990 .-- S. 136-137

See: Mahmudov N. Looking for ways to study the language perfectly ... // Uzbek language and literature. - Tashkent, 2012. - № 5. - B. 3-16.

Gorelov I.N., Sedov K.F. Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics: Textbook. - M .: Labyrinth, 2001 .-- P. 4.

Demyankov V.Z. Proceeding, or the generation of speech // A short dictionary of cognitive terms / Kubryakova E.S., Demyankov V.Z., Pankrats Yu.G., Luzina L.G. / Under total. ed. E. S. Kubryakova. - M .: Moscow State University. MV Lomonosov, 1996. –S. 129-134.

A short dictionary of cognitive terms // Kubryakova ES, Demyankov V.Z., Pankrats Yu.T., Luzina L.G. / Under total. ed. E. S. Kubryakova. - M .: Moscow State University. M.V. Lomonosov, 1996 .-- P. 47.

Specified dictionary. - B.51.

Demyankov V.Z. Concept and concept in fiction and in scientific language // Problems of philology. - Moscow, 2001. - No. 1. - S. 35-47.

Demyankov V.Z. Shown article.

Shvedova N.Yu. Russian language. Selected works. - M .: Languages of Slavic culture, 2005 .-- P. 603.

Mahmudov N. Looking for ways to study the language perfectly ... // Uzbek language and literature. - Tashkent, 2012. - № 5. - B. 9.

http: // rtsu slavist./t index php? option = com conten tack wiew & id = 149 & itemed = 80

Shvedova N.Yu. Russian language. Selected works. - M .: Languages of Slavic culture, 2005 .-- P. 603.

Rybnikova V.A. Linguistic conceptualization of society (based on English didactic texts): Author's abstract. dis. ... Cand. philol. sciences. - Krasnodar: Kuban state. un-t, 2011 .-- 20 p.

Lakoff J., Johnson M. Metaphors that we live by (Translated by N. V. Pertsov) // Theory of metaphors. - M .: Progress, 1990 .-- S 387-415.

A theory of metaphor. - M .: Progress, 1990 .-- S. 512.

Kubryakova E.S. Images of the world in the mind of a person and word-formation categories as their components // Izvestia RAN. A series of literature and language. - 2006. - T. 65. - No. 2. - C.11.