

Scientific Theoretical Basis and Methodology of Anthropocentric Research

Zokhida O. Amirova ^a

Karshi State University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

khulkar1061@gmail.com

Keywords: Culture, Psychology, Sociology, Ethnography, Culturology, Political Science, “Heart”, Semantic Features, “Foggy Something”, “Grassy Word”, “Rotating Volumes”, “Principle Meaning”.

Abstract: In contrast to the natural existence in a comparative and comparative aspect, the development of world linguistics in the anthropocentric paradigm increases the need for research on the speech tools of the language, the effectiveness of the word, its place in the formation of the linguistic image of the world, and its basic structure. The question of how language and culture interact is typically focused on identifying the similarities and differences in the ways that speakers of various linguistic and cultural traditions view their own existence. In world linguistics, the linguistic representation of the world and its main structure, the “concept”, is realized in modern linguistics in connection with the function of language, the development of the culture of a certain nation, and requires conducting scientific and theoretical research within the framework of this problem. In particular, identifying the corpus of language units as a component of the concept of “heart” in different linguistic cultures, the reflection and verbalization of this concept in the image of the linguistic landscape of the compared languages, as well as revealing the semantic features of the concept of “heart” make it possible to coordinate intercultural communication.

1 INTRODUCTION

It is vital to go deeply into the idea of "culture" while discussing the relationship between language and culture. Diverse opinions exist about how to interpret this idea. For instance, G.V. Elizarova lists axiomatic terms that appear intuitively clear, including "culture." It is quite hard to define a notion as complicated as culture, though. There are other definitions of culture, including "Culture is how we live here," that aim to convey the concept's complexity. The first definitional approach to the term "culture" is predicated on the idea that culture is a uniform condition shared by all cultures. Variations in a society are understood as variations in the degree of cultural development rather than variations in their core and content. Culture was a gauge of human advancement during the transition from savagery to civilization. A culture was seen as more evolved culturally the more evidence of civilization there was in its daily activities.


1.1 Commonality of Language and Culture in Linguistics

The article "Looking for ways to perfect the study of the language" by Professor N. Mahmudov The core of the anthropocentric paradigm, linguoculturalology as a whole, and the issues surrounding it were thoroughly and logically articulated. This essay can be regarded as the first in Uzbek linguistics to give thoughtful observations about linguo-cultural studies.

The article explains the key ideas in the linguocultural theory, how they were developed, and how there are variances in how they are interpreted.

With the start of F. Boas's anthropological studies at the close of the 1800s, the term "culture" started to be used to refer to various cultures. The way that attitudes regarding culture are changing is crucial for the significance of language. Language and culture are now seen to be intricately intertwined.

In the words of Sh. Safarov: “Language is a phenomenon that ensures human existence and social experience-activity. So, someone who is engaged in language research is involuntarily engaged in self-

^a <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4698-4532>

knowledge, because linguistic activity is determined by the essence of the phenomenon - its performer - the person and the entry of this person into social and interpersonal relations" (Safarov, 2008).

E. Sepir defined culture as a phenomenon that is the basis for the work and thinking of this society (Sapir, 1993).

G. P. Neschimenko understands cultural values as the result of the objectification of human spiritual activity (Neshimenko, 1999).

Cultural content and structure have been interpreted in a variety of ways based on the applicable elements, learning goals, and the academic institutions that house scientists and cultural experts.

The social definition of culture is predicated on the idea that it is a totally distinct condition from nature, with biological and physiological elements that are shared by a community of communicators rather than being exclusive to an individual (Oswald, 1993).

According to a cognitive definition of culture, an individual's acquisition of culture may be understood in terms of mental realities, structures, and processes. This method of conceptualizing culture is known as cognitive culture because it places a strong emphasis on culture as knowledge and cognition. (Jamoldinovna, 2020).

"According to many researchers, cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology are the leading directions of the anthropocentric paradigm" (Mahmudov, 2002). We are also in favor of asking this opinion in advance.

"The idea of the mutuality of language and culture arose at the intersection of linguistics and cultural studies and found its reflection in linguo-cultural studies, which studies the reflection of national culture in language" (Makhmaraimova, 2017).

M.K.Mamardashvili and A.M.Pyatigorsky noted that "culture is what the automatism of objectively oriented thinking introduces" (Mamardashvili, 1999).

Regardless of the particular scientific school to which they belong, all cultural scholars acknowledge the unique function that language plays in the organization of this intricate situation.

It could raise some concerns to refer to this society as "simplest." Different civilizations certainly exist, in our opinion, but they are seldom the "simplest" or "most developed."

However, none of the definitions provided are comprehensive, since they merely touch on a single dimension of the complex phenomena that is culture; they do not confine themselves to a particular "approach" to culture, nor do they take it into account in its whole.

According to Z.K.Tarlanov, "language is not only a simple form and a simple means of communication, but also a completely independent world among them, and although its laws and rules are expressed in the language medium, the social psychology of its owners and is closely related to the type and composition of the culture they create. Ethnoculture does not exist without ethnic language or at all, or even if it exists, it is not credible, because only through its language does the ethnos express itself in a complete and wide scale, delicately unique. On the other hand, language separated from the experience of ethnic culture, ethnic outlook and cognitive activity loses its deep essence and thus becomes one of the simple means of communication" (Tarlanov, 1984).

1.2 Types and Classifications of Communication Between Ethnic Culture and Perception of the World in Linguistics

Summarizing the above-mentioned views, points of view and opinions, we found it necessary to emphasize the following. Summing up the opinions expressed on the type of connection between ethnic language and ethnic culture and world perception on the other hand, we emphasize the following:

1. Although the unavoidable relationship between language and culture in general is acknowledged, the causative nature of this relationship is rejected.

2. Although several, frequently polar, remedies are suggested, this relationship is categorized as a cause-and-effect relationship:

a) "culture, its type, in general, even lifestyle is determined by language, its grammar and content";

b) "language cannot determine the type of culture, language and culture cannot be compared";

c) language is considered a "guide" to know reality to a limited extent;

g) The nature of the culture itself influences and determines the language itself;

d) Language, like culture, is shaped by ethnic "worldview," the essence of the people, and their sense of identity as a country.

It is a very difficult undertaking to interpret the link between language and culture. Thought, language, and culture are examples of ever-changing, dynamic entities. You have to "stop" them in order to learn them. But instead of being the same "language," "thought," or "culture," they will cease to exist and stay lifeless and apart from one another.

Whichever was the main one, it is indisputable that ethnos cannot exist without language; when

language disappears, ethnos and culture also disappear!

Any culture can only deteriorate in one way: the isolation of its constituent parts. In other words, language, as a separate cultural component, likewise perished at the same time as symbols vanished due to altered living circumstances (Sukalenko, 1992).

As a result, language, mind, and culture are so intricately entwined that, in actuality, they constitute a three-component totality, without which none of these elements could exist or operate. Collectively, they engage with the environment, reflecting and shaping it simultaneously. They produce phenomena known as worldscapes in the process.

1.3 Theoretical Foundations of Ethnolinguistic and Linguistic Studies

According to N.I. Tolstoy, ethnolinguistics and the ethnolinguistic approach to language are not new. Researchers of the history of linguistics associate some ethnolinguistic ideas with the names of I. G. Herder (XVIII century) and W. Humboldt (early XIX century), but ethnolinguistics appeared as a specific approach to language under the influence of its spiritual culture in the first quarter of the XX century. He is associated with the names of the ethnographer F. Boas, who studied languages without a written tradition, the language and culture of American Indians, and the linguist and ethnographer E. Sepir. E. Sepir makes at least two conclusions: language should not be viewed as a “system of purely conditional sound symbols”; differences between languages and dialects “are not limited by any patterns in our transition from one social group to another”. These conclusions apply broadly to religious beliefs, customs, art, and the like, to which dialect and similar phenomena can be applied.

Ethnolinguistics, both narrowly and broadly, is a branch of linguistics that presents and solves problems of language and ethnos, language and culture, language and folk mentality, language and mythology, etc. “For this field of linguistics, it is not typical to consider only folk culture, psychology, mythological imaginations (relevant for all types of human activity, as well as for the sphere of material production and consumption) in language, but the constructive role of language and its folk culture”, influence on folk psychology and folk creativity is important. This active feature of the language was discovered by I. G. Herder in the 18th century, and later, in the 19th century, by V. Humboldt and his numerous followers. Its recognition and influence are

characteristic of the early Russian philological and linguistic traditions, F.I. Buslaev, A.I. Afanasev and, especially, A.A. Potebnya (Sirota et al., 2019).

N.I. Tolstoy included the issue of the relationship between language and ethnicity among the most ancient issues. Language is one of the most basic, bright and important indicators of ethnos. It depends on other, historically very unstable and changing signs - territorial unity, culture, ethnic (national) identity, state structure, life reality, social organism and, finally, signs of anthropological type.

S.G. Vorkachev believes that linguocultural science is the newest branch of ethnolinguistics. The author introduces the research and description of the relationship between language and culture, language and ethnos, language and national mentality into the issues of this scientific field, “it emphasizes the trinity created on the basis of language, culture, human personality, and it is a lens through which the researcher of linguistic culture can see the material and spiritual identity of the ethnos. imagines as” (Gladkova et al., 2018).

1.4 Scientific Complexes Resulting from the Interaction and Influence of Language and Culture

Linguo-cultural science, according to B. I. Karasik (Karasik, 2001) is a comprehensive body of scientific knowledge that has developed as a result of language and culture's interconnection and impact. The author provides several explanations for this:

1. Taking into account the behavioral characteristics of different peoples and the common and specific aspects of communication in the solution of various issues, the rapid globalization of world problems, the need to foresee possible situations in which intercultural misunderstandings may arise, to determine the cultural values underlying communicative activity and their exact nature the need to understand.

2. The assimilation of research findings by linguists conducted by members of the objective integrative tendency in the development of the social sciences, a path that emerged at the confluence of many disciplines like as political science, sociology, ethnography, psychology, and anthropology.

3. The use of linguistic knowledge, including instruments for deciphering the collective experience encapsulated in all the nuanced meanings of words, phraseological constructions, long texts, formal settings, and the like.

V. I. Karasik claims that the inescapable question of what defines a language explains how linguistics

evolved into linguocultural science. Language, as a multifaceted natural product, is the most universal phenomena that exists. Language is the primary element of culture and plays a significant role in the creation of the world, as well as being a tool for managing interpersonal relationships, influencing people, recording social relationships, influencing one another, and keeping track of collective experience. Language is also an important means of communication.

“The uniqueness of the people's perception and understanding of the world, i.e., national-cultural and national-connotative information, is embodied directly in the standard of analogy”.

Numerous attempts have been made to successfully explain the culturally relevant qualities and nature of particular notes in the form of linguistic indications of existence, from the perspective of culturally oriented linguistics. Accordingly, V.I. Karasik places a premium on linguistics and country studies research, citing primarily the well-known writings of V.G. Kostomarov and E.M. Vereshchagin. Linguists base their study of language as an organic component of an individual's natural existence in social and natural environments on the theory that, when examining a language from a linguocultural perspective, it is best studied by contrast it with one's mother tongue or another foreign language.

“Ethnolinguistics provides basic ideas about the general and culturally specific (special) situations in the communication process, gives the communication participants the ability to evaluate their speech and communicative behavior from the outside, points them to the potential scopes that are likely to cause communication failures, the specific linguistic problems of the comparative plan. will show the measures related to the solution” . Approaching the word from the point of view of linguo-national studies, by its essence, this or that event is axiomatically specialized as a cultural meaning-giver, explanation is transferred from the field of language to the fields of history, mythology, and folklore.

According to V.T. Klovov, the development of linguistic and cultural direction, the desire to understand the essence of the cultural phenomenon is conditioned by human existence and a special form of society in the world. At the same time, the author emphasizes the scientific nature of the facts of a philosophical character to this day. The understanding of culture as a semiotic system, on the one hand, contains a certain part of information useful for society, and on the other hand, as a means of

finding and satisfying society itself, the scientific approach has clearly manifested itself.

Within the framework of the described relationship between language and culture, studies of the linguocultural direction are expressed as follows.

“Linguistic assessment category can be described as the main way of reflecting the value system in the language, an integral part of speech communication.” The author establishes a connection between the first direction and socially relevant data that is encoded in language as a semiotic code. The goal of linguistic semantics research is to make sense of the world using language and the instruments that humans have created to perceive it. The core concepts of lexical symbols, grammatical categories, and lexical and grammatical structures are studied in this manner. Studying global objects in a meaningful sense—which are arranged under broad conceptual categories that evolve differently in many cultures—becomes more intriguing from a linguistic and cultural perspective.

1.5 Exploring Linguistic Nomenclature: Recording an Individual's Knowledge of the World Through Linguistic Symbols

In connection with linguistic nomination is language's capacity to record human knowledge of the world through linguistic symbols. These symbols are especially employed to represent things and the ideas that society has created around them. This particular direction pertains to the investigation of novel approaches to world knowledge and additional language signals, such as word derivation, acquisition, structure, and proof. This is referred to as the word's internal form.

The study of linkages and parallels that underlie the creation of linguistic symbols in metaphorical and other contexts is a field of interest in linguistics.

The third line of inquiry focuses on the semiotic code, or the language used to gather and transmit cultural knowledge. This is a symbol paradigm. that is, it is crucial to establish lexical-semantic structures in the domain of lexical forms and functional-semantic structures in the domain of grammatical categories.

The fourth direction is related to the structure and operation of the speech system. In the framework of linguoculturalology, much attention is paid to scientific knowledge that constitutes a set of additional information of language carriers about objects of existence. The presence of this information indicates a certain level of cultural potential of the

speakers. Recently, great attention has been paid to such lexical units, which are interpreted as symbolic (fonovye znaniya), associated with signs specific to a particular culture. In addition, investigations devoted to the study of words that become cultural symbols in speech are also becoming interesting. Put differently, we are discussing the potential for studying language cues that are supported by the cultural symbol system established by another semiotic system as a backup method for obtaining, logging, and communicating socially relevant data. The study of the characteristics of the speech system's recording of socially relevant data is the subject of the fifth direction. The challenges with speech genres, according to V.T. Klokov, include documenting the rules governing the development of speech works and packing them full of particular sources depending on the subject and circumstances of expression for contemporary linguocultural study. Here, the linguistic behavior of the participants of the speech dialogue, the issues of recording the part of the cultural information by the participants of the dialogue related to their behavior, knowledge and intention rules take an important place. In other words, in this direction, linguocultural studies the creation of text, how text creators and consumers behave.

The dissemination of cultural knowledge within society is the subject of the sixth direction. Currently, effective means of communicating cultural knowledge are of special importance to linguistic and cultural studies. Speech culture associated with written and oral traditions transmits a great deal of cultural information about the social structures and norms that govern society. Here, specific ways of communicating cultural knowledge are made through the speech rules of conducting a conversation (starting, sustaining, and concluding a discourse), addressing, exhorting, forbidding, veiling, and other forms. The focus of contemporary linguoculturalism is on the unique aspects of communication that are facilitated by contemporary media, including computer technology, cinema and television, newspapers, advertising, and graffiti.

The quantity of cultural information that an idiom has in language is the subject of the seventh dimension. In this instance, the content of "ethno-*eidemas*," or symbols that are emotionally rich and take on the hue of emotional perceptions, is of great importance to linguoculture. Among them are forms of speech etiquette, appellatives and onemas with special national colors. It is acceptable to highlight color names and the like. For the carriers of a certain culture, *ethnoeidemas* are extremely important as

substitutes for logical-conceptual information and direct forms of expression of national psychology.

1.6 Nature of the Concept as One of the Basic Categories in Linguistic and Cultural Studies

Cultural words are tools for thinking and acting in certain ways about a variety of things, including concepts about a society's past experience, and they enable the perpetuation of these ways.

V.Z. Demyankov "tried to consider the concept and concept in literary and scientific language and he came to interesting conclusions".

In Latin, the form of *conceptus* is a passive adjective and means "to have arisen." The term "fetus" is found in the Latin term "concept" itself, and the terms "reservoir", "repository" are in the etymology of the term "concept", other than (transitive), for example, "joining, total union, system, "reservoir", "repository". It is also possible to trace the origin of such meanings as "formulation (editing) of legal acts", "fertilization, acceptance of seed".

The modern meaning of the concept "concept" is foreign to classical Latin. In medieval Latin, when the original meaning of the word was still alive, the metaphorical transference of "fetus concept" seems to have been very alive, so that it was not used much, even in medieval philosophical texts *conceptus*, not as a noun meaning "concept", but mostly as "fertilized" used as an adjective meaning. Later, when the Latin language became not the only language of science, but one of the languages of science, the term "conceptus" was rarely found.

Prof. N. In one of his articles, Mahmudov commented on the term "concept" and wrote: "In linguistic and cultural studies, a lot of attention is paid to the problems of the expression of the concept, when you get acquainted with the Internet materials, for example, you can see that this direction is extremely widespread in linguistics in Russia. It is also difficult to achieve. Even in recent years, a very large number of candidate theses are dedicated to the linguistic and cultural research of the concept in this or that language".

The notion must be viewed as the fundamental building block of culture when using a linguistic-cultural approach, which highlights the concepts that are significant to a given culture. There is complexity in the concept's structure. According to Yu.S. Stepanov, the idea has three structural layers: (1) the primary character; (2) one or more other "passive" indicators; (3) an outward, verbal shape that reflects

an interior form that is typically ignored entirely. Most of the scientists (S.G. Vorkachev, V.I. Karasik, Maslova V .A.), note that the concept is a complex structure and state that it is based on: 1) meaning; 2) image; 3) value. The constituents of the concept structure form the concept field or conceptsphere. National conceptsphere is characteristic of a specific nation. is a set of calculated concepts, the concept itself presents a conceptual part, elements. Today, in many cases, the "concept" is not only a "concept" (belonging to the subject), but also an initial, distant, incomplete, sometimes vague, only relatively fair, valuable and also refers to non-contradictory concepts that model real human concepts (reflected in scientific research) and interpret them in their own way.

According to V.Z. Demyankov, the term "concept" is recorded in English dictionaries as "concept, idea, general idea, concept". However, in the second half of the 19th century, this term is hardly found in classical artistic and philosophical literature. Two hundred years later, the landscape changes somewhat. Sinclair Lewis, Upton Sinclair, Henry Miller use the word "concept" a little, Jack London a little more. They are all Americans. This lexeme is used together with "metaphysical, ludicrous, wider and deeper concept" and other similar expressions.

In philosophical research, for example, J. Berkeley, D. Hume or J. In Locke's writings, the author finds the word conception, but the word sonsert is not there. E. Sepir offers a classification of concepts that can be expressed using language. E. The concept for Sepir is a capsule of thoughts that captures all aspects of life as much as possible. In modern scientific literature, the term "concept" is often used by cognitivists, artificial intelligence systems, psychologists, semioticians, etc. A different meaning of this term entered in the early 1970s with the ideas of semantic types: they call a concept a certain type of elements that are formed in the explanation of the semantics of a linguistic expression.

Sh. Makhmaraimova notes that "The semantic scope of the language, its main unit, finds its interpretation through the study of meaning. In cognitive linguistics and cultural studies, this is an issue directly related to the scope of concepts. On the other hand, it will be possible to solve this issue positively only by studying the concept, which is the main element of the scope of concepts. In this case, it is necessary to distinguish between concepts and understandings, and even when they are differentiated, it is necessary to understand that they are units of the same order, comparative character,

but with different meanings. If we compare it, we can see the words of heart and soul in Uzbek language and related concepts and concepts as an example.

The most frequent use of the word concept in Russian is associated with the use of this term in a different sense than "concept". The difference can be observed in the following framework: concepts are concepts that people have agreed upon and formed in order to "have a common language" in discussing their problems. exist, people just process them with one level of reliability (unreliability) or another.

1.7 The Term "Concept" Entered the Uzbek Language Relatively Recently and Its Linguistic and Cultural Meaning

The term "concept" is old and new in linguistics, until recently it was considered equivalent to the term "notion". The research behind the term "concept" recognizes its entirely specific meaning in a separate field of reference, as distinct from other fields. In this way, "he was one of the first to consider the concept of the world as an object of the "ideal world" in which "Being" is an expression of culturally determined symbols. These words can be analyzed as central points around which entire cultural spheres are formed.

According to Yu.S. Stepanovniig, "concept" is a phenomenon like an understanding. "In Russian, the words "concept" and "concept" are the same according to their internal structure: concept is a calque of the Latin "conceptus", and "concept" means "to begin" from concipere, that is, "concept, fetus" means the original meaning; understanding (ponyatie) comes from the Old Russian verbs pyati", pogati, ponati, the original meaning of which is "to seize, to take into one's personal possession, to take a woman as a wife", and they are also understood literally. S. Stepanov notes that at the same time these two words are seriously different from each other.

Yu.S. Stepanov states that understanding and concept are words of separate disciplines, with the latter being mostly employed in philosophy and logic and the former being a concept and a branch of logic (mathematical logic is a term of cultural science).

According to the author, the concept is "the cream of culture in the human mind; is the appearance of culture's entry into the human world. On the other hand, the concept - through this person is simply a person in a brochure, not a "creator of cultural values" - itself enters into culture, and in some cases influences it". In contrast to the term's literal definition, conceptions are felt as well as thought,

according to Yu.S. Stepanov. They are the focus of feelings, affection and dislike, and even disputes. In the mental realm of humans, the notion is the primary cultural master.

There is complexity in the concept's structure. It contains everything that is connected to the concept's appearance on the one hand, and everything that is part of the concept's structure on the other, making it a cultural fact (etymology); history, contemporary associations, valuations, etc. reduced to their most basic elements.

“According to its study in philosophy and logic, the size corresponding to this concept is distinguished - the class, and the content - a set of general and specific signs of the concepts corresponding to this class.” In mathematical logic, the term concept designates only the content of understanding. Thus, the term concept becomes synonymous with the term meaning. The term meaning is essentially synonymous with the content of the concept. The term culture in science, it should be noted that the term concept is used only when the cultural content is abstracted, but only the structure is discussed. Also, the structure of word content is understood in modern linguistics.

Yu.S. Stepanov separates the notion into three "layers," or components: (1) the primary character; (2) one or more extra "passive" characters; and (3) an internal form that is mirrored in an outward linguistic form but is often ignored.

E.S.Kubryakova, V.Z.Demyankov, Yu.G.Pankrats, L.G.Luzina's "Brief Dictionary of Cognitive Terms" defines the concept as follows: the informational structure reflecting knowledge, the mental lexicon of memory manifested in the human psyche, the conceptual system and language of the brain, the operative meaningful unity of all scenes of the world. According to the authors, the most important concepts are reflected in the language. For the formation of a conceptual system, it is necessary to assume the existence of some structures or primary concepts from which all others have grown. Concepts, as interpreters of meaning, are subject to further refinement and modification.

V.V. Kolesov says that two terms should be distinguished: "conceptusa" (concept) and "sopsertuma" (meaning "fetus"; "seed" is a direct concept)[27]. "Emphasizing the principle meaning of the term "concept", it cannot be used as a synonym for the term "concept". According to the author, the concept in its essence externalizes "pure existence", where both time and space are burdened; it is the fourth dimension beyond eternity and mental contemplation.

It is precisely for this reason that the concept has no form: it is itself an internal form derived from an external form, regardless of the word. The similes used by Russian philosophers in different periods to explain the concept or the concept taken in this sense are characteristic: "foggy something", "grassy word", "rotating volumes", "principle meaning" and so on.

However, as the formation of thought is removed as a past moment by turning from an image into a form, the concept is perceived as an independent value of the size of the linguistic sign and clearly reflects the cultural concepts of the image itself. If we take mental structure as a concept, it is reasonable to consider it as a type of mental activity. Semantic syncretism of the concept is formed in the image, analyzed in the concept, and manifested in the symbol as a unity of "thoughts – feelings", and then at the same time it can place both the concept, the image, and the symbol as a conceptual image, or a figurative concept. The concept is the starting point of the semantic completion of the linguistic sign.

As a result of what is considered a beginning, the development of word meanings becomes an end as a sign of culture, and affects from the enrichment of faith to the concept of modern culture. Therefore, the concept, figuratively speaking, the existence of speech and thought, on the one hand, is defined as "noumenons" of the language, phoneme, morpheme and other content plan known to science, as it is vitally important for any culture. A concept is something that does not undergo changes in the semantics of a word sign, and on the contrary, creates practical possibilities of language and speech, determines them in their choice, and directs the thoughts of speakers in this language.

The first form of concept manifestation is images. The meaningful form of the concept is a symbolic sign. A real sign cannot be acquired from others, it grows out of the language as a result of natural language development. The image can be described, the concept can be defined, but the sign needs to be interpreted. A sign is not only a synthesis of image and understanding, but deeper than that - it is a synthesis of presence and being that approaches the concept as one of its forms.

A.A. Vetrov emphasizes that the terms chosen to name the continuous stages of the process of word meaning increase are not accidental. They have meaning from their first meanings. Grammatical signs of their management: image - what? and meaning - what? but understanding - what? and about what? The concept cannot be extended by any question at all, because it is the completion of the process at a new level of semantic development of

liveness in the language, and the point of conclusion; it is the source of the general content reflected in the relation of many forms and meanings. According to V.V. Kolesov, "conceptum" is the same "fetus" of the divine logos, not given, but given, but it is an archetype of thought that constantly changes its grammatical and substantive forms, first of all, its figurative forms.

From the above-mentioned ideas, it is possible to make the following impression that the concept cannot be polysemous while being a "pure meaning" by itself - it is syncretic. The concept appears as a semantic dominant connecting the knowledge of reality - object and potentiality - subject, it is a dialectic of whole and parts. According to A.F. Losev, "the concept, simply put, is a unity of opposites... a unity of thought with its subject." According to N.D. Arutyunova, concepts are formed at the intersection of noun and verb categories: verb categories are created in the movement of thought-proposal meaning, and noun categories record them as existence, the fact that happened.

Agreeing with S.A. Askoldov, V.V. Kolesov explains that the concept is always "its own national subjectivity": in words, the concept is considered as a hyperonym for the same ideas, images or concepts, that is, it is nothing but general concepts, it can be called universals, but are individual specificities specific to consciousness.

According to S.A. Askoldov's understanding, "concept" is the content of the act of understanding, and understanding is presented as a three-part form of thinking: the subject - its state - the forgiveness of this state

Thus, the concept concept of "conceptum'e", a concept different from *sonceptusa*, appeared in the Leibtsian philosophical tradition (to which S.A. Askoldov belonged) only at the beginning of the 20th century. The concept is understood not as the final product of the structure of the sign (modern, for example, the view typical of the French postmodernists), but as the first ideas of the meaningful form of the image.

Not being able to fully grasp the essence of the concept, but always striving for completeness, thought performs three integral actions: seeing and perceiving in art, finding and understanding in science, believing and naming in culture.

The concept, being in appearance (image), immediately aspires to the sign, the completeness of forms, because the appearance of its natural existence - word - is a symbol, and its meaningful duality (understood appearance: understanding - image, figurative understanding) becomes its symbol based

on its essence. Taking into account all that has been said, the author notes that the concept is generally understood in different ways.

2 CONCLUSIONS

Language, culture and ethnicity are closely related. At the modern stage of linguistic research, it became clear that only the examination of the formal system of the language and its communicative functions limits the real place of the language in the process of culture creation. A different approach to language, which is important for determining its essence, is seen in the study of language not only as a means of communication, but, first of all, as an integral part of ethno-culture.

1. From a linguistic point of view, it is not possible to enumerate all the opinions expressed in this regard; among them, the dominant view is that the concept is the inner form of the word and, therefore, it cannot have any form outside its "shell".

2. All the above-mentioned views, according to the author, are considered philosophical in one way or another, because they concern the problem of the concept. There would be no internal connection between these "points of view" without the idea of some vague, moment-to-moment, but never-abstract thing that binds them all together in this statement that normalizes the various points of view. Therefore, it becomes something only by appearing as an image - a concept - a sign in its meaningful forms.

3. The coordinates of the concept in space and time are divided into parts and measures only in perception and knowledge, the concept itself is outside of both time and space: the eternity and irrelevance of the vanishing point. The concept unites the past and the future without being the present, it unites both the here and the there without being here. It includes both rationality and irrationality, positivity and negativity.

4. When thinking about the relationship between language and culture, some scholars unquestionably recognize the connection between language and culture in a broad sense, which they deny in the causal-inspective description. Another view would describe this relationship as causal, but would suggest a very different, even contradictory, proposition.

5. It is quite challenging to describe how language and culture interact. Thought, language, and culture are dynamic, ever-evolving processes.

6. Thus, language, mind, and culture create a totality consisting of three components that are so intertwined that nearly none of them can operate without the other (which in turn does not exist). They all engage in

interactions with the cosmos, reflecting and shaping it simultaneously. By using a variety of linguistic techniques, individuals create a linguistic landscape of the world that conveys information about the distinct environment they live in. This is achieved by the methodical and organized assembly of socially relevant symbols. The "leading" cultural themes in the global language landscape embody ethnic thinking.

REFERENCES

- Safarov, Sh. (2008). Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent.
- Sapir, E. (1993). Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies. Moscow: Progress.
- Neshimenko, G. P. (1999). Ethnic Language: Functional Differentiation Experience: Based on Comparative Study of Slavic Languages. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- Oswald, V. D. (1993). Decline of Cognitive Functions in Old Age and Dementia Processes. *Foreign Psychology*, 1, 21.
- Jamoldinova, B. M. (2020). Linguocultural Scientific Directions and Interpretation of Language and Culture in Modern Linguistics. *Bulletin of Amur State University Named After Sholom Aleichem*, (3)40, 104-115.
- Mahmudov, N. (2002). In Search of a Comprehensive Study of the Language... *Uzbek Language and Literature*, (5), 3.
- Makhmaraimova, Sh. T. (2017). *Linguocultural Studies*. Tashkent: Chulpon Publishing House.
- Mamardashvili, M. K., & Pyatigorsky, A. M. (1999). Symbol and Consciousness. *Metaphysical Reflections on Consciousness, Symbolism and Language*. Moscow: School of "Languages of Russian Culture".
- Tarlanov, Z. K. (1984). *Language and Culture*. Petrozavodsk.
- Sukalenko, N. I. (1992). *Reflection of Everyday Consciousness in the Figurative Language Picture of the World*. Kiev: Naukova Dumka.
- Didactic Possibilities of Pragmalinguistics in the Course of Studying Russian Language and Speech Culture. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru>
- Sirota, E. V., & Parakhonko, L. V. (2019). Wilhelm von Humboldt and Anthropology: Its Development in Modern Linguistics. *Linguo-Rhetorical Paradigm: Theoretical and Applied Aspects*, (24), 85-88.
- Gladkova, A. N., & Larina, T. V. (2018). Anna Wierzbicka: Language, Culture, Communication. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 22(4), 717-748.
- Bergelson, M. B. (2005). *Intercultural Communication: Issues of Theory and Practice (Prospectus of a Textbook)*. Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication, (3), 54-68.
- Vorobyev, V. V. (2008). *Linguocultural Studies*. Russian University of Peoples' Friendship.
- Karasik, V. I. (2001). On the Categories of Linguocultural Studies. *Linguistic Personality: Problems of Communicative Activity*. Collection of Scientific Papers, 3-16. Volgograd: Peremena.
- Mahmudov, N., & Khudoyberganova, D. (2013). *Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek Similes*. Tashkent: Ma'naviyat.
- Klovov, V. T. (2000). Main Directions of Linguocultural Studies within the Framework of Semiotic Approach and Applied Linguistics. Issue 2. *Language and Social Environment*. Voronezh: Publishing House of VGTU.
- Krasnykh, V. V. (2019). Language-Consciousness-Culture-People: "Closing the Circle". *Language Ecology and Communicative Practice Journal*, 4(1), 32.
- Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Linguocultural Studies: Textbook for University Students*. Moscow: Academia.
- Pavilonis, R. (1983). *The Problem of Meaning: Modern Logical-Philosophical Analysis of Language*. Moscow: Mysl.
- Prokhorov, Y. E. (2004). *In Search of a Concept*. Moscow: Pushkin Institute of Russian Language.
- Sternin, I. A. (2005). Structural Components of Word Meaning. In *Russian Studies and Modernity: Materials of the VII International Scientific-Practical Conference* (Vol. 1, pp. 30-39). St. Petersburg.
- Sadohin, A. P. (2009). *Intercultural Communication: Textbook*. Moscow.
- Sorokin, Y. A. (1977). *Method of Establishing Lacunae as a Way of Identifying Specific Local Cultures (Fiction in a Cultural Perspective)*. In *National-Cultural Specifics of Speech Behaviour*. Moscow.
- Morkovkin, V. V. (1988). Contrastive Value of Russian Words as an Object of Interpretation in Pedagogical Linguistics and Educational Lexicography. In *Theory and Practice of Educational Lexicography* (pp. 14). Moscow.
- Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2004). *Language and Intercultural Communication*. Moscow: Moscow State University.
- Karaulov, Y. N. (2000). Indicators of National Mentality in Associative-Verbal Network. In *Language Consciousness and World Image* (pp. 191-206). Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Demyankov, V. Z. (2000). Concept and Idea in Literary and Scientific Language. *Philology Issues*, 1(7), 35.