

DISCURSIVE-MODUS CONCEPT AS A SOURCE OF PHRASEMOSEMIOSIS

Xalikova Latofat Uktamovna

*Senior teachers, Tashkent State Transport University,
Department of Foreign Languages.*

*Normurodov Sherzod Shuxrat o'g'li
Fayziyev Abduraxmon Rustam o'g'li*

*Students of Faculty of Economics, Group YU 5, direction of Jurisprudence
(international transport law)*

Abstract: *Cognitive phraseology is a specialty of cognitive linguistics. The basic category is a cognitive concept, a basic concept in the development of the cognitive theory of phraseology is an ethno cultural concept of a special kind, dealing with the representation of signs of indirectly derived nominating phrases. This article attempts to identify the strategy and tactics of linguistic and cognitive phrase exploration.*

Keywords: *cognitive phraseology, cognitive linguistics, concept, phrases, discourse-modus concept.*

The emergence of cognitive phraseology as a special branch of cognitive linguistics is due to several factors. Firstly, phraseological material, due to its illogical paradoxically, is not always embedded in the Procrustean bed of the existing canons of linguocognitistics. Secondly, the strategy and tactics of linguocognitive research of phrasemics have not yet been determined. The proposed work is one of the first attempts to eliminate this scientific lacuna. Since the main category of linguocognitistics is a concept, the basic concept in the development of the theory of cognitive phraseology turns out to be a special kind of ethnocultural concept that presupposes the representation by signs of an indirectly derived nomination – phrasemes. The phrase–generating concept quite clearly reveals its original purpose – the ability to serve the birth of a sensory-objective meaning in the form of a certain image. That is why the beginning of the generation of the phraseme and the motivator of its appearance in speech is the concept (Latin concept – ‘grain; germ’). Based on this etymology, V. V. Kolesov compares the semantics of this term with the ‘germ of the prototype’, qualifying it as a kind of ‘first sense’. Already under its etymological meaning, the concept can in no way be identified with either a concept or a category denoting already formed and logically filtered objects of thought understood and structured semantic content. The sign-generating concept, although it is an effective stimulator of language cognition, is still a potential, still unformed "pro-log", a kind of mental education preceding the concept, a kind of generalized representation. And in

this capacity it can be interpreted as a potential concept, a proposition, an associative-thinking "sprout" capable of "sprouting both in word, thought, and deed" [4]. The concept objectified by the phraseme, in contrast to a separate phraseological meaning, is the totality of all the meanings of the phraseme, an integral semantic image associated with this signification. In addition, the concept verbalized by the phraseme is always included in the value-semantic continuum of culture. At the same time, the vector essence of its nature changes: the concept becomes something in the form of which culture itself enters the mental world of a person, and turns into a kind of "clot of culture in the consciousness of a person" [4]. Mainly due to these properties, the concept is quite organically connected with phrasemosemiosis.

In modern works on phraseology, the authors of which are interested in linguocognitistics, the term phraseological concept is usually used. In this case, we prefer a different term formation – a phrase-generating concept – for two reasons. Firstly, because of the imperfect typology of concepts. Secondly, due to the distortion by the existing term of the ontological essence of the correlation of the mental category, the most important representative of which is the concept, and the linguistic means of its verbalization, which are units of different language levels. Currently, they talk about lexical, syntactic, and phraseological concepts, which only indicate the means of verbalization of the concept, but not its nature. The typology of concepts by the way they are verbalized is very conditional and does not reflect the nature of the concept itself. To eliminate this incident, it is necessary to focus on the mechanisms and cognitive-pragmatic motives for the emergence of concepts of different types. Such, in our opinion, are (a) everyday concepts verbalized by words, (b) predications objectified by syntaxes, and (c) maxims expressed by paroemias. The search for the ontological nature of the concepts that generate phrasemes can proceed from understanding the communicative and pragmatic purpose of phrasemes. Their purpose, as we have already written earlier, is rather not in naming the subject of thought, but in expressing an evaluative and semantic attitude to it [Alefirenko 1990]. Therefore, phrasemes are selected by speakers to adequately express in the appropriate discursive situation the evaluative-emotive meaning that our speech-thinking intentions project.

So, the "melting pot" in which the concept is cast – the mental configuration that generates the phraseme – is the discourse, and its content is evaluative-emotive, or modus semantics. As a result, such a concept, which appeared as a result of the discursive activity for the presentation of modus semantics, needs not just indirect, but indirect signification. Let's call such products of discursive consciousness discursive-modus concepts, the language verbalizers of which are phrasemes. Let's focus on two integrated definitions – discursive and modus. 1. The first position: the phrase-generating concept has a discursive-synergetic nature. What is the basis of this thesis? – First of all, on the synergetics of discourse, in the bosom of which it is formed and

functions. As we have already noted, one of the most important categorical properties of discourse is its ability to generate a new meaning that is not additive to the semantics of its constituent textual units. Its sense-generating ability is because, unlike the actual utterance, discourse consists of elements of previously produced discourses. Complex semantic configurations that need a variety of means of secondary signification originate in the deep layers of discourse. It is here, in the presence of the necessary conditions, that contradictions between the structure-forming factors of discourse become aggravated, as a result of which the first sparks of linguo-creative stimulation of the processes of secondary semiosis are carved.

Such contradictions are found both between linguistic and extralinguistic mechanisms of structuring discourse and within them. External counteraction includes the reasons for the actualization of linguistic or extra-linguistic stimuli of the "life" of discourse. Internal contradictions permeate linguistic semantics, which is actively involved in the constitution of the meaning-forming discourse. These contradictions predetermined the appearance in linguistics of various semantic theories – "reflective", relational and formal-logical [1].

According to the first, the semantic content of the discourse is determined by the integration of the subjects of the nomination displayed in the consciousness under the tasks of the communicative act. The relational theory draws attention to the second stage of discourse – the modeling of various relations between both verbalized and non-linguistic subjects of thought. The formal-logical concept, being between the generativist and the theory of speech acts, supplies and strengthens the idea of the creative possibilities of discourse with the ideas of subject-object speech generation and the need to take into account external (socio-cultural and pragmatic) conditions of communication. The role and significance of each of these aspects in the constitution of discourse depend, of course, on the understanding of the nature and essence of the discourse itself. The first aspect subordinates discourse to language, which in this case should determine the semantic content of discourse by its semantics. The second one proceeds from the ideas of discourse as a grid of communicative and pragmatic relations, and the third one considers discourse as a sense-generating device. The inferiority of each of these approaches is obvious since none of them meets the complex understanding of discourse as a thought immersed in life. In them, there is an unacceptable absolutization of one of the parts of the concept of "discourse": either the utterance (text) or its external environment. In the first case, the utterance is considered the basis of the discourse, and its external context is the accompanying background. In the second case, the opposite is true. Both the semantics of the utterance, the socio-cultural conditions of text formation, and the anthropological human factor are mandatory components of the semantic content of the discourse, in the depths of which the phraseme not only functions but also generates. Yu. N. Karaulov wrote about the

anthropological factor regardless of phraseology at the time. All the diversity of human interaction with the world of discourse is quite succinctly reflected in his well-known judgment: "Behind each text, there is a linguistic personality who owns the language system" [2]. No less expressive and fair was his phrasing in the mouth of K. F. Sedov: "behind every linguistic personality, there is a multitude of discourses produced by it" [3].

However, to understand the role of discursive thinking in the formation of phrases, it is important to consider not so much the process of interaction of a linguistic personality with discourses, as interaction with the discourses of the entire ethnic-cultural community, which is specifically implemented in the speech activity of each person - a member of this community. Let's recall a Rayleigh phrase associated with a well-known discursive situation: 1) "Where are you taking us? I can't see a thing" – the enemies cried out to Susanin with a heart (K. Ryleev); 2) Polina Andreevna slammed the door in a panic, which was stupid. I was left in pitch darkness and fright, I even forgot which way the exit was. And how can I run if I can't see a thing? (B. Akunin). The idiom is not visible, nor could it be put into the mouth of any Russian speaker who is under the magical influence of his ethnic-discursive consciousness, even though it contains an incomprehensible word again. This ancient word is formed, it is believed, from the word *stitch* 'stitch, path, path'. So, the literal meaning of the expression is 'not even a path is visible'. And here is another interpretation: a metal ring on the horse's arc, to which a leash is attached. And if he was not visible, then it means that it is pitch dark in the yard. Then, a secondary meaning arose: – 'darkness, darkness, darkness'. The second meaning is a crumb, a drop, a spark, a little *Something-L.*' (V. I. Dahl). However, to see the road and there was no special need to look at it through such a crumb as the again. But to unhitch and harness a horse on a night or in bad weather, you need to see it. In such a situation, it was no wonder to hear the coachman's grumbling: "Well, the darkness (darkness) is not even visible." This is how the expression is fixed in the ethnic-discursive consciousness, nothing is visible - 'absolutely nothing is visible, it is very dark'.

The individual-personal meanings of the speaker, thus, instead of freely constructed linguistics, are forced to overcome a triple barrier: a) conform to ethnocultural standards, b) be formed on a cognitive basis common to the whole community, and c) obey the dictates of ethno-discursive consciousness, the system of meanings and the laws of discursive strategy. So, the synergetics of such a discourse is formed by several semantic energy flows: a) verbal, b) ethnocultural and c) *modus*. 2. The second position is related to the mode. The *modus* aspect largely determines the semantics and pragmatics of the phraseme. The *modus* performs the function of attributing a particular phraseme to a certain cognitive-pragmatic type. *Modus* (from Latin *modus* – measure, method, image) denotes the property of a phraseological

denotation inherent in it only in the corresponding discursive states and depending on the discursive context of the denotation and those associative-semantic connections in which it is located. In other words, it is the mode of existence, the type, and the nature of a communicative event.

According to the mode type, the phrasemes of a particular language are grouped into semantic fields. According to *modus vivendi*, phrasemes are used to denote the lifestyle of people, the conditions of their mutual understanding, and vice versa; according to *modus procedendi*, phrasemes are endowed with a circumstantial character, including denoting a way to achieve a goal. *Modus rectus* and *modus obliquus* are associated with the figurative embodiment of speech-thinking intentions. "The presence of a figurative component in a concept," writes Z. D. Popova, "is determined by the very neuro-linguistic nature of the universal subject code: the sensory image encodes the concept, forming a unit of the universal subject code" [2]. The main mechanisms for the formation of a phrase-generating concept are cognitive metaphor and cognitive metonymy. Cognitive transfers can be both objective (denotative) and abstract (significative). In both cases, being identified by a direct meaning, the phraseological meaning contains all its main features. When a trope or figure performs a characterizing function, E. V. Shelestyuk (2004) notes, the figurative meaning is replaced or combined with the name of the attribute. Cf.: black box, boneless tongue, white crow, gray mouse. Meaning-forming in such cases is an attributive component - a metaphorical epithet. It is he who, having lost the primary denotative attribution, brings into the generalized and integral meaning of the phraseme that associative-figurative seme, which serves as a discursive vector for the formation of the *modus* connotation of the idiom, conditioning its expressive, emotive and axiological properties. The meaning-forming function of the attributive component is explained by the fact that figurative meanings that generate a metaphorical epithet entail a semantic transformation of the nominal lexeme (the old (old) sparrow). Thus, the attributive component in the zoomorphism of a shot (old) sparrow, undergoing metaphorization (shot > experienced, experienced), actualizes the abstract potential semes of the nominal component. As a result, grammatically, the main component of the sparrow loses the subcategorical meaning of a particular animal, the group meaning of the subject of wildlife, the nuclear seme "bird species" and realizes the abstract potential seme "man". As part of the phraseme, the attribute component is shot (old) and implements the semes 'experienced', and 'wise'. Such an attributive component is included in the formation of a detailed cognitive metaphor. As a result of the phraseme, the shot (old) sparrow becomes a representative of the discursive-*modus* concept – "a seasoned person". The essence of the concept-forming role of cognitive metaphor is that, on the one hand, metaphor presupposes the presence of similarities between the properties of its semantic referents, since it must be understood, and on the other hand

- the dissimilarity between them, since the metaphor is designed to create a new meaning. The phrase-generating concept arising based on a metaphor is the result of the interaction of two co-conceived conceptual spheres. As a result of their comparative overlap, a hybrid (discursive-modus) concept is formed, which partially inherits the properties of the original conceptual spheres, but is still a new formation. If a metaphor includes a homogeneous element, it is transformed into a symbol. Metaphor is a product of associative-symbolic thinking [1]. It is based on the comparison. A person can compare the unknown with the known, and this shows his modus attitude to objective reality. By referring sensually perceived signs to abstract and not directly observable objects, the metaphor performs an epistemological (cognitive) function.

Analyzing the phrasemes that have arisen according to the model of cognitive metaphor, we get "access to the "hidden" or forgotten senses that the metaphor actualizes" [5]. The fact is that "the processes of human thinking are largely metaphorical. This is what we mean when we say that a person's conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined. Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because they exist in the conceptual system of man" [5]. A cognitive metaphor is a means of perceiving one object through another, a means of referring an object to a class to which it does not belong, through the so-called categorical shift. In the process of metaphorical phrasemaking, the traditional categorical grid that defined the vision of the world is destroyed, and new associative-semantic connections and relationships arise, reshaping the cognitive space, changing the standard idea of a particular fragment of the surrounding world [1]. Explicatures and implicatures serve as the metonymic mechanism of phrase formation. In this regard, special attention should be focused on economic interference in speech-thinking acts and on the interpretation of discourse. The focus is on metonymic overlays and other principles of metonymy in languages and discursive contexts [6]. Within the framework of the metonymic strategy (based on the contiguity of thought structures), two options are outlined: a phenomenological and a numerological strategy of metonymic transfer. The first sets conceptualization through examples, samples, or simply through individual manifestations. For example, love can be conceptualized through examples of falling in love (Romeo and Juliet, in love like a cat, is not a metonymy) or through manifestations of love: all ages are submissive to love. Emotively loaded metonymies are represented by two conceptual types – inclusive and exclusive.

Inclusive metonymies are created based on (a) transferring the name from the attribute of the object to the object itself (for example, "white crow > man"); (b) transferring the name of the part endowed with the attribute to the whole object (for example, "throw out the white flag > surrender"). In exclusive metonymies, the concepts of the subject and the human condition caused by it interact (for example, "rainy day + human experiences > limitation"). The basis for the interaction of concepts

in both types of metonymy is the characteristics of objects expressed by epithets (most often modus and utilitarian assessments). The majority of metonyms (60.7%) belong to the exclusive type. Thus, the phrase-generating potential of a discursive-modus concept is formed due to a wide associative-discourse spectrum of non-conventional implicature (discourse implicature). The hidden meaning of the phraseme, as a rule, differs significantly from the explicit one ("explicitates") and even contradicts it (mouse fuss – "troubles, worries"). The unconventional implicature of the discursive-modus concept, which is the source of phrasemosemiosis, is revealed to the linguistic consciousness in the process of decoding the cognitive metaphors and metonymies of the inclusive and exclusive type that model it.

REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N. F. *Konsept – ponyatiye – kategoriya v svete sovremennoy lingvokognitivistiki* // Nauchnie vedomosti BelGU. Seriya: Gumanitarnie nauki. 2010. Vip. 7, № 18 (89). S. 5–12.
2. Karaulov Yu. N. *Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost*. M.: Yeditorial URSS, 2003. 264 s. Alefirenko N. F. *Frazeologicheskoye znachenije: priroda, suščnost* // Grani slova: sb. nauch. st. k 65-letiyu prof. V. M. Mokiyeenko. M.: Elpis, 2005. S. 21–27.
3. Kolesov V. V. *Filosofiya russkogo slova*. SPb.: YUNA, 2002. Popova Z. D. *Ocherki po kognitivnoy lingvistike*. Voronej: Istoki, 2001. 191 s.
4. Sedov K. F. *Diskurs i lichnost: Evolyusiya kommunikativnoy kompetensii*. M.: Labirint, 2004. 3290 s.
5. Halikova, L. U. (2021). THE THEORETICAL BASES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE IS TEACHING ENGLISH VOCABULARY. *Международный научно-практический электронный журнал «МОЯ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНАЯ КАРЬЕРА»*. Выпуск № 25 (том 2)(июнь, 2021). Дата выхода в свет: 30.06. 2021., 109. https://www.mpcareer.ru/files/ugd/a62191_102fd91a032e413891a72621802b89f4.pdf#page=109
6. Халикова, Л. У., & Абдураззаков, Ш. А. У. (2021). ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ МОТИВАЦИИ У СТУДЕНТОВ НЕЯЗЫКОВЫХ СПЕЦИАЛЬНОСТЕЙ ПРИ ИЗУЧЕНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА. *Academy*, (6 (69)), 43-44. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/formirovanie-motivatsii-u-studentov-neyazykovyh-spetsialnostey-pri-izuchenii-angliyskogo-yazyka>
7. Халикова, Л. У., & Мустафаева, К. Н. К. (2021). РАБОТА С АНГЛИЙСКИМ АЛФАВИТОМ И ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ОТДЕЛЬНЫХ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ ЯВЛЕНИЙ. *Academy*, (6 (69)), 39-40. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/rabota-s-angliyskim-alfavitom-i-izuchenie-otdelnyh-grammaticeskih-yavleniy>

8. Uktamovna, X. L. (2021). TEACHING COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES IN MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCES*, 2(6), 53-56. <https://cajotas.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJOTAS/article/view/189>
9. Xasanova, V. X., Muratova, G. K., Atamuhamedova, G. S., & Xalikova, L. (2021). The development of speech competence among students of non-linguistic technical universities in teaching Russian. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, 8(2), 296-301. https://ejmcm.com/pdf_3207_d50a883c70847e131ebd9a35f4beaefa.html%20https://ejmcm.com/article_7252.html
10. Xalikova, L. U. (2018). THE ESSENCE OF INTEGRATED SKILLS IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' CRITICAL THINKING. In *International Scientific and Practical Conference World science* (Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 66-67). ROST. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=Vfj4SAAAAAJ&citation_for_view=Vfj4SAAAAAJ:WF5omc3nYNoC
11. Uktamovna, K. L. (2022). MASTERING EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH SKILLS IN A FOREIGN LANGUAGE. *Innovative Technologica: Methodical Research Journal*, 3(10), 70-75. <https://it.academiascience.org/index.php/it/article/view/343>
12. Uktamovna, K. L. (2022). USE OF MULTIMEDIA FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF VARIOUS METHODS OF LEARNING. *Innovative Technologica: Methodical Research Journal*, 3(10), 64-69. <https://it.academiascience.org/index.php/it/article/view/342>
13. Uktamovna, K. L. (2022). Opinions of Scientists About the Deixis Phenomenon. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 8, 117-121. <https://www.geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejlat/article/view/1505>
14. Khalikova, L. U. (2019). INNOVATIVE APPROACHES IN THE METHOD OF TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN UNIVERSITIES. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (11), 654-657. <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=42407815>
15. Sh, S., Kh, R. Z., & Khalikova, L. U. (2022). New Ways to Learn English. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 14, 7-11. <https://www.geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/2489>
16. Irkinovna, S. S., Xakimberdievna, R. Z., & Uktamovna, X. L. (2022). Methods of Teaching a Foreign Language in Technical Universities. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 14, 1-6. <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/2488>
17. Ataboyev, I. (2022). TANBEHNING LINGVISTIK CHEGARALARI HAQIDA VA TIL HODISASI SIFATIDA TANBEHGA LUG'AT TAMONDAN

YONDASHUV. ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ ИДЕИ В МИРЕ международный научный электронный журнал.

18. Turg'unova, F. (2022). *INGLIZ TILIDAGI MAQOLALAR SARLAVHALARINI LEKSIK VA GRAMMATIK JIHATDAN TARJIMA QILISHDA XATOLARNING SABABI (Tarjima xatolarining ta'rifi va tasnifi)*. ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ ИДЕИ В МИРЕ.
19. Uktamovna, K. L., & Ismailovna, M. S. (2021). MODERN METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN NON-LANGUAGE UNIVERSITIES. *Вестник науки и образования*, (11-2 (114)), 85-87. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/modern-methods-of-teaching-english-language-in-non-language-universities>
20. Халикова, Л. У. (2021). РОЛЬ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ МЕТОДИКИ В ОБУЧЕНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ. *Вестник науки и образования*, (15-1 (118)), 30-33. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/rol-kommunikativnoy-metodiki-v-obuchenii-angliyskomu-yazyku>
21. Irkinovna, S. S., Hakimberdievna, R. Z., & Uktamovna, X. L. (2022). The Importance of Learning A Foreign Language in the System of Training Highly Qualified Personnel in the Field of Transport. *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 14, 9-12. <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/tjm/article/view/2643>