

THE RELEVANT CONCEPTUALISM OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AS THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM

Samatullayeva Lobar Sherzod qizi - a student of Uz-Fin pedagogical institute

Xodjayorova Sayora Abdullayevna - an English teacher of Uz-Fin Pedagogical institute

ABSTRACT

The article studies the role of cognitive linguistics as an independent field in modern-day science of language with some theoretical and exemplified details. It might be obvious that semiotics as the holistic branch of language system deals with collaborative concept of language paradigms in human centralization represented with the term of ‘Anthropocentric Paradigms’ from the middle of 20th century. Being in the very middle part of animistic-anthropocentric construction, human being is the negotiator of, mainly, all creativity and thoughtfulness. Besides that, cognitive linguistics owns the integrative relevance in the concepts of human and nature.

Key words: cognition, anthropocentric paradigm, linguistic picture, semiotics, syntax, semantics, consciousness, phonology, psychology, neuropsychology

I. INTRODUCTION

Having a superior effect of complexity, human language is the real phenomenon of delivering emotions, manipulation and culture. All of the cognized elements have the potential access to become existent reality. As not only appearing evolutionary, language ability of the human race is the specific way of understanding social beliefs. Cognitive linguistics is taken here to refer to the approach to the study of language that began to emerge in the 1970s and has been increasingly active since the 1980s (now endowed with an international society with biennial conferences and a journal, Cognitive Linguistics). A quarter century later, a vast amount of research has been generated under the name of cognitive linguistics. Most of the research has focused on semantics, but a significant proportion also is devoted to syntax and morphology, and there has been cognitive linguistic research into other areas of linguistics such as language acquisition, phonology and historical linguistics. We can see three major hypotheses as guiding the cognitive linguistic approach to language:

- language is not an autonomous cognitive faculty
- grammar is conceptualization
- knowledge of language emerges from language use

These three hypotheses represent a response by the pioneering figures in cognitive linguistics to the dominant approaches to syntax and semantics at the time, namely generative grammar and truth-conditional (logical) semantics. The first principle is opposed to generative grammar's well-known hypothesis that language is an autonomous cognitive faculty or module, separated from nonlinguistic cognitive abilities. I begin by distinguishing constant properties of consciousness (a focus and periphery, constant movement, a point of view, and the need for background orientation) from variable properties. Focus of active consciousness are seen as reflected in language in intonation units. Within them, ideas are expressed differently depending on their activation cost, characterizable in terms of given, accessible, or new information. By hypothesizing that each focus of consciousness is limited to one new idea, it is possible to achieve a clearer understanding of lexicalization and related phenomena.

II. CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

Due to the reason that metaphor makes language with not normal structural meaning or having somewhat distinguishing effect of words and their delivering pragmatic meaning, I suppose it as literal art. Conveying concepts thanks to it enables the technical advantage by simplifying the theory and abstractionism.

There are two main roles for the conceptual domains posited in conceptual metaphors:

- **Source domain:** the conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions.
- **Target domain:** the conceptual domain that we try to understand.

A mapping is the way in which a source domain tracks onto and describes aspects of the target domain. Mappings describe the mental organization of information in domains, the underlying phenomenon that drives metaphorical usage in language. This conceptualization relates closely to image schemes, mental representations used in reasoning, through the extension of spatial and physical laws to more complex situations.

A primary tenet of this theory is that metaphors are matter of thought and not merely of language: hence, the term conceptual metaphor. The metaphor may seem to consist of words or other linguistic expressions that come from the terminology of the more concrete conceptual domain, but conceptual metaphors underlie a system of related metaphorical expressions that appear on the linguistic surface. Similarly, the mappings of a conceptual metaphor are themselves motivated illustrative

schemes which are pre-linguistic schemas concerning space, time, moving, controlling, and other core elements of embodied human experience. Conceptual metaphors typically employ a more abstract concept as target and a more concrete or physical concept as their source. For instance, metaphors such as 'the days [the more abstract or target concept] ahead' or 'giving my time' rely on more concrete concepts, thus expressing time as a path into physical space, or as a substance that can be handled and offered as a gift. Different conceptual metaphors tend to be invoked when the speaker is trying to make a case for a certain point of view or course of action. For instance, one might associate "the days ahead" with leadership, whereas the phrase "giving my time" carries stronger connotations of bargaining. Selection of such metaphors tends to be directed by a subconscious or implicit habit in the mind of the person employing them.

III. COGNITIVE APPROACHES TO GRAMMAR

The approach of grammar is that of an autonomous mental faculty that it is governed by mental processes operating on mental representations of different kinds of symbols that apply only within this faculty. Noam Chomsky contributed considerable influence in most linguistic branches including cognitive grammar. Another cognitive approach to grammar is that which is proposed by proponents of cognitive linguistics, which holds that grammar is not an autonomous mental faculty with processes of its own, but that it is intertwined with all other cognitive processes and structures. The basic claim here is that grammar is conceptualization. Some of the theories that fall within this paradigm are construction grammar, and word grammar. Thus, letters, words, and sounds are language symbols that represent thought processes. A cognitive schema, for example, is a mental plan that a human being develops to address recurrent specific situations. For example, a human might form a step-by-step plan for how to react when meeting a stranger and carry out this plan unconsciously. In linguistic terms, languages might create a certain standard, or schema, for putting action words in different tenses. Cognitive grammar practitioners are also interested in how words and phrases can be altered and moved to create a certain effect or express a certain idea. Rhetoric, or the use of language for persuasive purposes, might be a particular topic of focus for many cognitive grammar researchers. Even literary devices like comparative similes and metaphors can become important areas of study in cognitive-based focuses. Chomsky proposed that the human mind contained instinctual guidelines for using words and sounds - or phonology - to create comprehensible phrases and sentences. These ideals were universal to all humans in general terms if not in specifics, and thus the human brain naturally contained mental capacities for language from birth. In general, the structure system of language shows the balanced

level with the matter of tone or intonation. All together in order to make a whole conceptualization acts naturally in speech and grammar builds all systematically.

IV. COGNITIVE SEMANTICS

Cognitive semantics refers to a way of approaching linguistics that deals with the way the mind processes language in relationship to its meaning, or conceptual content, within a given context. Unlike traditional approaches to linguistics, cognitive semantics cannot be easily broken down into branches of study such as phonetics, syntax, etc., because it sees all of these as interrelated to meaning. Cognitive linguists also reject the notion that linguistic processing is a specialized function that can be separated from other mental processes. Psychological approaches focus on the relationship between language and other psychological phenomena, such as reasoning and memory. Formal approaches tend to address specifically grammar-related aspects of linguistics, sometimes treating meaning as a separate issue altogether. Cognitive semantics, however, tries to unify the two methods by asserting that both fall under the umbrella of semantics. In fact, we could come into consideration like cognitive linguistics in generalized way of exclaiming notions whether they are into specific elements of language or not. In general, semantics refers to the branch of linguistics that deals with how language conveys meaning. It is closely related to pragmatics, the relationship of language to its real-life context. Within the field of cognitive semantics, however, these two concepts are considered inseparable from all other areas of linguistics. This approach to language attempts to demonstrate the ways that the mind uses language to organize experience, and vice-versa. Some approaches to linguistics assert that the brain has specialized functions for dealing with linguistic input, but cognitive linguists see this distinction as artificial. Neurolinguistic research on the subject is inconclusive, for example.

V. CONCLUSION

While most conservative directions of English and other languages have already been become somehow explored, anthropocentric paradigms, including cognitive linguistics could offer multiplied research methods and standards. Having said that in this work about no-ever boundary of lingua sources that human factor centralized, linguistics make everything proceed into another step ahead with colorful diversity in logical sense and addressing firm interpretation practically. As an example, Louis Menand gave an opinion as ‘Cognitive science is rapidly developing area, so it could be that there are some surprises around the corner. That does seem to be kind of there the trend line is leading’. Accordingly saying, this piece of modest writing can be hoped to be stunning to the scholars and students in the form of brief theoretical purpose in extra linguistic current research methodology. In addition, it could be factual if we cite that language is not the only eligibility for communication, but it’s the matter of

cognition, morality and culture. In integration with cognitive science, cognitive psychology and neuropsychology, cognitive linguistics plays a pivotal role of research database with theory, while listed types of cognition subject navigates more practical value. So this research shares some ideas about the linguistic picture of the world via the inspiration given by the book ‘Cognitive Linguistics’ written by William Croft.

REFERENCES

1. Vaysgerber Y.L. Rodnoy yazik i formirovanie duxa. –M.: Yeditorial URSS, 2004.
2. Gumbol'dt V. Izbrannie trudi po yazikoznaniyu. –M.: Progress, 1984.
3. Maslova V.A. Kognitivnaya lingvistika. –Minsk: TetraSystems, 2008.
4. William Croft Cognitive Linguistics Published online by Cambridge University Press: 05 June 2012
5. Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006.
6. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Volume 12, Issue 10, October 2022
7. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/cognitive-linguistics/metaphor/>
8. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/extended-conceptual-metaphor-theory/brief-outline-of-standard-conceptual-metaphor-theory-and-some-outstanding-issues/4FF7CCD2F96630941A59E630E7ACD87A>
9. https://ru.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Cognitive_linguistics&action
10. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conceptual_metaphor#:~:text=In%20cognitive%](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conceptual_metaphor#:~:text=In%20cognitive%20)
11. Rasulova M.I, Shukurova Z.I Comparative Typology of English, Uzbek and Russian Languages. –Tashkent: 2017
12. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Numerical_cognition
13. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Numerical_cognition#Ethnolinguistic_variance