

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6067605>

**Panjieva Nasiba Narmahmatovna**

*Phd. Head of chair English and literature  
of the Termez State University*

**Key words:** *concept, evaluation, metaphor, conceptualization, categorization, knowledge structure, cognitive linguistics.*

Conceptualization is one of the most important processes of human cognitive activity, which consists in understanding the information coming to it and leads to the formation of concepts, conceptual structures and the entire conceptual system in the human brain (psyche) [4, p.93]. Conceptualization is often considered as a "cross-cutting" process of knowledge structure for different forms of knowledge and the emergence of different structures of knowledge representation from some minimal conceptual units [3].

The building blocks of the conceptual system are concepts that reduce the variety of observed and observed phenomena to something unified, thereby bringing them under one category. Concepts allow you to store knowledge about the world, contribute to the processing of subjective experience by substituting information for certain categories and classes developed by society. Two or more different objects can be considered as instances and representatives of the same class / category [1; 219]. The most complete concept of a conceptual system was described in the work of R. I. Pavilenis. In his research, the conceptual system acts as a system of opinions and knowledge about the world, reflecting the cognitive experience of a person, both at the prelinguistic and linguistic level, but not reducible to any linguistic essence [5, p.12].

As a component of the conceptual system, we consider individual meanings or concepts formed in the process of cognition of the world and reflecting information about this world. "Even before getting acquainted with language," Pavilenis wrote, " a person gets acquainted with the world to a certain extent, learns about it; thanks to the known channels of sensory perception of the world, he has certain information about it, distinguishes and identifies the objects of his knowledge. The assimilation of any new information about the world is every indie based on the one he already has. The system of information about the world that is formed in this way is the conceptual system that it constructs as a system of certain human representations of the world" [7, p. 101].

The process of conceptualization is closely related to the process of categorization: being a classification activity, they differ at the same time by the final result or by the purpose of the activity. The first is aimed at identifying certain minimal units of human experience in their ideal content representation, the second is aimed at combining units that are similar in one way or another or are characterized as identical into larger categories.



With the formation of language, the cognitive development of reality takes on new forms, providing a way out of the immediate perceived and storing experience in the long-term memory of a person [6, p. 154].

Without classification of language elements, it is hardly possible to construct a linguistic theory that is adequate to the object of research, because "... the study and description are always preceded by classification" [1]. Classifying is undoubtedly a universal property of language, which is given great attention in modern linguistic theory. So, for example, classification is spoken of as a mandatory property of the "language picture of the world", the classification moment is present in the language category itself, which is often inaccessible to direct observation, and so on. At the same time, we take the following research path as a basis: "...from the lexicon of language-to the analysis of classification, and from classifications - to making judgements about the main categories, classes, categories, etc., within which the world is reflected and represented in the human language" [1].

In relation to the material we study, the problem of conceptualization and categorization of metaphors are particularly relevant, since stylistic device can be represented as a conceptual space, the main constituents of which are knowledges, considered as mental representations of the conceptual system.

References:

1. Видинеев Н.В. Природа интеллектуальных способностей человека. – М., 1987.
2. Концептуализация и смысл. Сб. науч. трудов / Под ред. Полякова И.В. – Новосибирск, 1990.
3. Кубрякова Е.С., Демянков В.З., Панкрац Ю.Г., Лузина Л.Г. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. – М., 1996. – 245 с.
4. Ортега–и–Гассет Х. Две великие метафоры // Теория метафоры (под ред. Н.Д. Арутюновой) - М.: Наука. 1990. - с. 69.
5. Павиленис Р.И. Проблема смысла. Современный логико-сравнительный анализ языка. – М.: Мысль. 1983. – 286 с.
6. Панжиева Н.Н. Репрезентации структур знаний в стилистических приёмах. // Международный научный журнал «Молодой учёный», №16.2020
7. Панжиева Н.Н. Когнитивно-стилистика парадигма оценочных номинаций лица в английском и узбекском языках. –Ташкент « Мухаррир », 2017-123 с.
8. Eshmuratova.D.U. The English phraseology and phraseological units. Tashkent 2021
9. Eshmuratova.D.U. Lexico- stylistics formation in the proverbs. Academicia 2020
10. Schwarz M. Einführung in die Kognitive Linguistik.– Tübingen, 1992.

As the language material shows, a significant number of metaphorical formations are distinguished among evaluative words. Taking into account the cognitive approach to language, it is possible to consider metaphor as a cognitive process that expresses and forms new concepts and without which it is impossible to obtain new knowledge [1; 13, etc.]. It



should be noted that the speaker's ability to create new meanings through metaphor, its role in cognitive processes is a subject of close analysis by many researchers. It is revealed that the metaphorical method of nomination is one of the most frequently used ways of developing language semantics, which allows us to designate new realities: one entity or state is described in units intended for describing other things [1; 7; 10; 15].

Thus, metaphorization is one of the ways to represent knowledge. Let's consider the process of metaphorization on the example of evaluative lexemes.

For example: fish – 1. An animal which lives in water, is covered in scales and uses its fins and tail to swim. 2. the flesh of a fish when used as food; 3. (collog) person (cool, queer, etc.)

As can be seen from the dictionary definition, the subject-logical meaning of this lexeme includes a description of the denotat "animal" and the conditions of its existence. This description, at first glance, does not contain any signs indicating the possibility of a metaphorical reinterpretation of this lexeme. However, a significant number of metaphorical phrases with this lexeme type: “cold fish”, “queer fish”, “strange fish”, as well as a large number of phraseological units using the word “fish”, such as “big fish”, “cool fish”, “dull fish”, “fresh fish”, “loose fish”, “odd fish”, “poor fish”, “shy fish”, “a fish out of water”, etc., indicates the high figurative potential of this fish tokens. Let's consider the cognitive mechanism of formation of metaphorical formations of the above-mentioned units, which is based on physical and cultural experience associated, for example, with "fishing": "fish is slippery"; "fish is cold blooded"; "fish is difficult to catch"; "fish is shaky", etc.

Metaphorical formations with the word "fish", thus, serve as a means of understanding a particular concept only due to their empirical basis [1], in the quality of which "fishing" acts. It is this empirical basis that gives rise to an extremely wide range of associative connections of the lexeme "fish", which are fixed in the associative dictionary Roget's Thesaurus: fishy, dishonest, slippery, snaky, coldblooded, foxy, shaky, immorel, etc.

Thus, the data of human experience related to physical objects form the basis for a large variety of metaphors that include the lexeme “fish”. According to researchers [1, 12,13, 8], cognitive metaphor has three levels of explanation: 1) surface language; 2) semantics and syntax; 3) cognition.

The description of the metaphor, which is limited to the first two levels, is incomplete, since it does not explain the cognitive nature of the metaphor as a component of human cognition. Metaphor as a cognitive process is included in the context of a broader evolutionary process of cognition, in which it is necessary to take into account the sensually perceived environment in which new knowledge is born. Considering a metaphor in the cognitive aspect involves studying not individual metaphors and their models, but metaphorical concepts in the system. To demonstrate this position, we can give examples with so-called orientation metaphors. The concept of “orientation metaphor ” was introduced by J. Lake off and M. Johnson [13]. Metaphors of this type are associated with the spatial orientation “top– bottom”, "inside- outside", "front - back ”, " deep-shallow”, " Central-peripheral”. J. Lake off and M Johnson note that such metaphorical orientations are



not accidental - “they are based on our physical and cultural experience”, for example: High status is up; Low status is down, i.e. high status corresponds to the top; low status – to the bottom.

Categories that include the "high" component have a social and physical basis and are associated with the concepts of "important person; superiority", "high rank"; in other words, this component, referring to physical or cultural experience, is associated with the concept of "success", "high position", "power", the "down" component also has a physical and social basis and is associated with the opposite concepts of "low rank", "old work-out", "low of money", etc.

As the above examples have shown, spatial metaphors of the “top – bottom ” type contain some value judgements accepted in society. In Western culture “ "high “ is consistent with the concept of ” good“, and ” down “ – ” bad”.

### **REFERENCES:**

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс. // Теория метафоры. – М.: Наука. 1990. С. 5-32.
2. Болдырев Н. Н. Язык и система знаний Издательский дом ЯСК. Москва, 2019 480 с.
3. Концептуализация и смысл. Сб. науч. трудов / Под ред. Полякова И.В. – Новосибирск, 1990.
4. Кубрякова Е.С., Демянков В.З., Панкрац Ю.Г., Лузина Л.Г. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. – М., 1996. – 245 с.
5. Маккормак Э. Когнитивная теория метафоры // Теория метафоры. – М., 1990. С. 358–386.
6. Ортега–и–Гассет Х. Две великие метафоры // Теория метафоры (под ред. Н.Д. Арутюновой) - М.: Наука. 1990. - с. 69.
7. Павиленис Р.И. Проблема смысла. Современный логико-сравнительный анализ языка. – М.: Мысль. 1983. – 286 с.
8. Раңиева N.N. Когнитивно-стилистическая парадигма оценочных номинаций лица в английском и узбекском языках. –Ташкент « Мухаррир », 2017-123 с.
9. Теория метафоры. / Вступ. ст. и сост. Н.Д. Арутюновой; Общ. ред. Н.Д. Арутюновой и М.А. Журиной. – М.: Наука. 1990.
10. Видинеев Н.В. Природа интеллектуальных способностей человека. – М., 1987.
11. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Stylistics of literary text. Tashkent: “Turon-Iqbol”, 2016 271 p.
12. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Cognitive Linguistics. Tashkent: VneshInvestProm , 2018 159 p.
13. Lakoff G. Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1980. P. 3–32.



14. Roger's Thesaurus of English word and phrases. N.Y.: Pequin books. 1966. - 712

p.

15. Schwarz M. Einführung in die Kognitive Linguistik.– Tübingen, 1992.

