

Modern Approaches To Study Of A Concept In Linguistics

L. Dadaboyeva teacher at Namangan State University

M. Holmatova at Namangan State University

Abstract: The question of a concept and its description is one of the most difficult in modern science. Initially it decided within philosophy. Though the term “*concept*” could not be used in a philosophical discourse, the sense problem, and its realization in the world of things or language always occupied one of the central places in philosophy. In the most general view the question of a concept is reduced to a problem of relationship of the ideal and material worlds – thinking, consciousness and language as the most significant for this research of categories. In this article we shall discuss modern approaches to study a concept in modern linguistics.

Keywords: modern approaches, discuss modern, study

Introduction

In the short dictionary of cognitive terms the notion of the *concept* is considered, how (lat. *conceptum* – thought, the contents, concept) – “... operational substantial unit of memory, mental lexicon, conceptual system of language of the brain, all picture of the world reflected in human mentality”. In turn, a mental lexicon — it “... the system reflecting in language ability of knowledge of words and units similar to them, and carrying out the difficult functions connected both with words, and with structures of representation of encyclopedic knowledge standing behind them”[1]

Literature review, Methodology

For the first time in domestic science the term the concept was used by S. A. Askoldov-Alekseev in 1928. The scientist defined a concept as mental education which replaces in the course of thought an uncertain set of subjects, actions, cogitative functions of the same sort (concepts a plant, justice, mathematical concepts)[2, p.267-279].

D.S.Likhachev approximately in the same time used notion of a concept for designation of generalized cogitative unit which reflects and interprets the reality phenomena depending on education, personal experience, professional and social experience of the native speaker and, being some kind of generalization of various word meanings in individual consciousnesses of native speakers, allows communicating to overcome individual distinctions existing between them in understanding of words. The concept, according to D. S. Likhachev, doesn't arise from word meanings, and is result of collision of the acquired value with personal life experience of the speaking. The concept in this plan, according to D. S. Likhachev, carries out replaceable function in language communication [3,p.3-9].

V.I.Karasik leads a number of approaches to the concepts, developed by different authors. Among them we will call the following:

concept – the idea including abstract, concrete and associative and emotional and estimated signs, and also the pressed history of concept[4,p40-43];

concept – personal judgment, interpretation of objective value and concept as substantial minimum of value[5,p.280-287];

concept is the abstract scientific concept developed on the basis of concrete everyday concept[6];

concept – the essence of concept shown in the substantial forms in image, concept and of a symbol[7];

concepts – the peculiar cultural genes entering a genotype of culture, self-organizing integrative functional and system multidimensional (at least three-dimensional) the idealized shapings relying on conceptual or pseudo-conceptual basis[8,p11-35].

V.I.Karasik characterizes concepts as “mental educations which represent being stored in memory of the person significant realized typified fragments of experience”, “multidimensional mental education as a part of which the figurative and perceptual, conceptual and valuable parties”, “a fragment of life experience of the person”, “endured information” , “quantum of endured knowledge” are allocated[9,p.59].

A.A.Zalevskaya defines a concept as objectively existing in consciousness of the person perceptual and cognitive and affective formation of dynamic character unlike concepts and values as products of the scientific description (constructs)[10,p.39]

In one of the latest works A.A. Zalevskaya characterizes a neural basis of a concept – activization of many separate neural ensembles distributed on different sites of a brain, but entering a uniform set. Access to all these sites is provided at the same time thanks to the word or any other sign. From the psycholinguistic point of view A.A. Zalevskaya emphasizes the individual nature of a concept – multidimensional simultanny structure. The concept is a property of the individual, – she writes[11,p.234-244].

S. G. Vorkachev defines a concept as “operational unit of thought”, as “unit of collective knowledge (sending to the highest spiritual sushchnost), having language expression and noted by ethnocultural specifics”[12,p43-52].If no mental education has ethnocultural specifics, it, according to the scientist, doesn't belong to concepts.

M.V. Pimenova notes: “That the person knows, considers, represents about objects of an outside and inner world and there is that is called as a concept. The concept is an idea of a world fragment”[13,p.208].

V. V. Krasnykh defines a concept so: “most abstracted idea “cultural subject”, not having visual prototypical image, though visual and figurative associations, with it connected” are possible. V. V. Krasnykh defines a national concept so: “most the general, most abstracted, but specifically represented (language) consciousness, the idea which has undergone to cognitive processing of “subject” in total all valent communications noted by the national and cultural it is marked; “some kind of curtailed deep “sense” of “subject”[14,p.272]

Thus, in the concept V. V. Krasnykh a concept can be only unit of high degree of the abstraction having national and cultural specifics, called by the word and including verbal associations addressed to a concept.

The concept as mental formation of high degree of abstractness is connected mainly with the word. It follows from this that it includes all communicatively significant information besides a subject concern. First of all, it instructions on the place taken by this sign in lexical system of language: its paradigmatic, syntagmatic and word-formation communications – that F. Saussure calls “importance” and that, finally, reflects “the linguistic value of extra language object”[15,p49-50].

The concept, according to S. A. Askoldov, E.S. Kubryakova, S. H. Lyapin, O. P. Skidan 's scientific definitions, is “the multidimensional cogitative construct reflecting process of knowledge of the world, results of human activity, its experience and knowledge of the world, storing information on it”. M. A. Holodnaya treats a concept as “the informative mental structure which features of the organization provide possibility of reflection of reality in unity the different

quality of aspects". According to R. Pavilens, concepts are "the meanings making cognitive basic subsystems of opinion and knowledge"[16,p.49-50].

Methodologically important we consider reasonings on structure of a concept by Yu. S. Stepanov. The concept, in his opinion, includes such components, as "1) the main, actual sign; 2) additional or some additional, passive signs which are not actual, and historical; 3) the internal form which usually not so isn't realized, imprinted in an external verbal form"[17,p.40-43]. The first component – the main, actual sign of a concept – we mean, "is known" for everything to carriers of this or that language, this or that culture. Expressed verbally, it a communication medium of representatives of a certain ethnic community, the nation, the people, a nationality. Unlike it the second component – the additional, passive sign of a concept – finds the relevance far not for all ethnos; it is available to representatives of a certain social group, to concrete microcommunity. And, at last, the third component – an etymological sign or an internal form – is the least actual for linguistic as experts of concrete sciences go in for history of life of the word mainly.

It is known that concepts enter the area correlated to mentality as by a great number of cognitive, the emotional and behavioural stereotypes of the nation. The border dividing mindset and mentality – concepts in wide and concepts in a narrow sense – is adequately indistinct. As the only criterion degree of a massive and invariability of the cognitive and psychological stereotypes reflected in lexical semantics of language[18,p.37-48].

Speaking about classifications of concepts, it is necessary to emphasize that classifications different scientists take various signs as a principle. We will begin with structurally semantic typology. So, A.P. Babushkin classifies concepts on lexical and phraseological [19,p.12,50-53]. From the structural-semantic point of view lawfully allocation in independent types of prepositive, prepositional and other concepts, as is done by N. A. Krasavsky.

In a basis of discursive classification S. A. Askoldov and V. I. Karasik put "the principle of ways of development" world - scientific, art and ordinary, and allocate scientific, art and ordinary concepts in separate type[20,p3-16].

The lingvocultural concepts is one more criterion of differentiation, obviously, their belonging to the sphere of knowledge or consciousness which they serve. Concepts can typologized not only structural-semantic, discursive, but also sociological. So, D. S. Likhachev classifies all concepts on the following groups; universal (for example, "death", "life"), ethnic ("fatherland", "intellectuals"), group ("scene" for the actor and the viewer), individual (they completely depend on personal experience, system of values, cultural level of the specific person)[5,p.280-287]. From extent of possession of culture, i.e. level of education, good breeding, intelligence, depends a sphere of concept of the specific person.

Conclusion

Summing up the result of all aforesaid about a concept, it is necessary to emphasize that the category of a concept receives the interdisciplinary status as it is used in two new paradigms: linguocognitive and linguocultural[21,p.3-10].

Representatives of the first direction (E. S. Kubryakova, N. A. Boldyrev, I. A. Sternin, A. P. Babushkin) interpret a concept as unit of the operational consciousness acting as complete, not dismembered reflection of the fact of reality. Addressing in the course of mental designing (conceptualization) of subjects and the world around phenomena, concepts reflect the content of knowledge, experience, results of all activity of the person and results of knowledge to them world around in the form of certain units, knowledge "quanta".

Representatives of the second, culturological direction (A. Vezhbitskaya, N.D Arutyunova, V. I. Karasik, D. S. Likhachev, Yu.S. Stepanov, L.O. Cheynenko, S. H. Lyapin, V. I. Shakhovsky, S.G. Vorkachev) consider a concept as the mental education noted to some extent by ethnosemantic specifics[22,p.6-7].

So, three main approaches were outlined in linguistic understanding of a concept. First, in the broadest sense the number of concepts joins the lexemes which values make the content of national language consciousness and form 'a naive picture of the world' native speakers. D. S. Likhachev assumes that set of such concepts and is formed to a sphere of concept of language)[5,p.280-287] in which the culture of the nation concentrates. In such approach the way of conceptualization of the world in lexical semantics is defining, the main research means – conceptual model by means of which basic components of semantics of a concept are allocated and stable relations between them come to light. Secondly, in understanding Yu. S. Stepanov and Neroznak refer the semantic educations noted by lingvocultural specifics and in one way or another characterizing of carriers of a certain ethnoculture[23,p.78-89]. Set of such concepts doesn't form sphere of concept as there is nobody the complete and structured semantic space, but occupies in it a certain part – conceptual area. And, at last, to number of concepts refer only semantic educations which list is adequately limited and which are keys for understanding of national mentality as the specific relation to the world of its carriers.

Generalization of the points of view on a concept and its definitions in linguistics allows to come to the following conclusion: the concept is unit of collective consciousness (sending to the supreme cultural wealth), having language expression and noted by ethnocultural specifics.

Used literature:

1. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е.С.Кубрякова, В.З.Демьянков, Ю.Г.Панкрац, Л.Г.Лузина. М., 1996.
2. Аскольдов С.А. Концепт и слово.// Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста. Антология. М., 1997. - С.267-279
3. Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка // Изв. РАН - СЛЯ - 1993, № 1. – С.3-9.

4. Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. М., 1997.С.40-43
5. Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка. //Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста: Антология. М., Academia, 1997. -С. 280-287.
6. Соломоник А. Семиотика и лингвистика. М., Молодая гвардия, 1995.
7. Колесов В.В. Язык и ментальность. СПб, 2004.
8. Ляпин С.Х. Концептология: к становлению подхода //Концепты. Научные труды Центроконцепта. Вып.1. Архангельск, 1977. - С.11-35.
9. Karasik V. I. Introduction in cognitive linguistics 2004, p. 59.
- 10.Залевская А.А. Психолингвистический подход к проблеме концепта // Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики. Воронеж, 2001, с.39.
- 11.Красавский Н.А. Эмоциональные концепты в немецкой и русской лингвокультурах. Монография. Волгоград, 2001.С.40-59
- 12.Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. М., 1997.С.40-43
- 13.Добровольский Д.О. Национально-культурная специфика во фразеологии (1) // ВЯ. 1997. № 6. С.37-48
- 14.Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. М., 1996.С.94-97,216-235
- 15.Бабушкин А.П. Типы концептов в лексико-фразеологической семантике языка. Воронеж, 1996.С.12,50-53
- 16.Карасик В. И. Культурные доминанты в языке // Языковая личность: культурные концепты. Волгоград-Архангельск. 1996. С.3-16
- 17.Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. М., 1997.С.40-43
- 18.Добровольский Д.О. Национально-культурная специфика во фразеологии (1) // ВЯ. 1997. № 6. С.37-48
- 19.Бабушкин А.П. Типы концептов в лексико-фразеологической семантике языка. Воронеж, 1996.С.12,50-53
- 20.Карасик В. И. Культурные доминанты в языке // Языковая личность: культурные концепты. Волгоград-Архангельск. 1996. С.3-16
- 21.Ангелова М.М. "Концепт" в современной лингвокультурологии / М.М. Ангелова // Актуальные проблемы английской лингвистики и лингводидактики. Сборник научных трудов. Выпуск 3. - М., 2004. - С. 3-10.
- 22.Дорофеева Н.В. Удивление как эмоциональный концепт (на материале русского и английского языков): АКД. Волгоград, 2002.С.6-7
- 23.Красавский Н.А концепт "Zorn" в пословично-поговорочном фонде немецкого языка. // теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика. Выпуск 2. Язык и социальная среда. Воронеж. Изд-во ВГТУ, 2000.С.78-89//eidos.rsl.ru