



ON THE SOURCE OF FORMAL IN COGNITIVE LEARNING OF LANGUAGE

Allayarova Zebiniso Boymuratovna

Pedagogical institute of Karshi state university

Annotation

Studying language cognitively is high level of logic and semantic analyses. There is difference between cognitive linguistics and linguistic cognitology. The scientific conclusions drawn from the study of the literary form of language are derived from the earliest fundamental sources of the cognitive approach to language. Since linguistic cognitology approaches the problem of knowledge on the basis of the principle of "language unity → knowledge", in any case, language unity and research serve as a basis.

Keywords: language, studying in cognitive way, logical analysis, semantic analysis, line viewpoint, identity of language, formal step, word, meaning, conception, the demand of the time.

Introduction

Cognitive learning of language is the highest stage of logical and semantic analysis. Cognitive linguistics and linguistic cognitology differ. While cognitive linguistics chooses the category of knowledge as an object, linguistic cognitology takes the unit of language as an object. In cognitive analysis, a linear approach is preferred. The formal stage of the linear study of language units leads to the cognitive analysis of linguistic phenomena, especially the text, in order to define the essence of the word (meaning) and concept, to identify commonalities and differences of meaning and concept, to clarify categorical and fundamental differences between events. Formal logic serves as the methodological basis for these analyze. Basic concepts language, cognitive learning, logical analysis, semantic analysis, linear approach, linguistic unity, formal stage, word, meaning, concept, essence, event, categorical difference, principle, text, cognition, formal logic, methodological basis, period requirement, social necessity, social order, linguistic paradigms, language, speech, horizontal linear analysis, vertical linear analysis, linguistics, knowledge, linguistic cognitology, cognitive linguistics. At different stages of language research, language phenomena are analyzed in different aspects based on period demand and social order. After all, "each epoch sets a specific goal and specific requirements for its science. The development of science is inextricably linked with the advanced philosophical thought





of this period, the achievements of the leading fields of science for the period. Because the sources of different disciplines are multifaceted, the leading philosophical thought of the period determines which aspects of the source of learning from the sciences should be given special attention, and how to reflect existing laws in logical categories. Leading linguists dealing with the history of linguistics acknowledge that modern and independent linguistics has a history of three centuries: 1) Linguistics of the XIX century was engaged in the issues of origin, kinship, development and classification of languages and was recognized as comparative-historical linguistics; 2) There are two internal stages in the linguistics of the twentieth century: a) the stage of studying the literary form of language; b) the stage of studying the structural features of language; 3) In the linguistics of the XXI century, the focus is on the study of the structural features of speech. The problem of the effectiveness of expressing one's own opinion and understanding the opinion of others is a social order facing the linguistics of the new century.

The scientific conclusions drawn from the study of the literary form of language are derived from the earliest fundamental sources of the cognitive approach to language. Since linguistic cognitology approaches the problem of knowledge on the basis of the principle of "language unity → knowledge", in any case, language unity and research serve as a basis. Traditional linguistics, which studies literary speech units called formal stages in science, has been concerned with discovering, processing, and describing aspects of linguistic phenomena in accordance with the literary norm. As a result of the analysis of each type of speech unit separately from speech and text, the first conclusions were reached in revealing their typical general semantic and functional values. For example, the typical meanings of words have been restored on the basis of generalizations of the concepts they convey in a sentence. In general, the meanings of language expressions were evaluated based on their linear relationship in speech. The object and methods and results of the analysis of any scientific paradigm cannot be absolute, detached from previous or related paradigms. The relationship of succession and partnership between them is clearly visible. In other words, it should be noted that, for example, a structural approach is not separate from a formal approach, and pragmatic or cognitive research cannot be seen as completely independent of formal and structural analysis. For example, by the 1970s, the formal stage of Uzbek linguistics had been completed, and science had fulfilled its huge social task of developing and inculcating literary language norms in the public mind. At the next stage of succession, a strong foundation was laid for the study of the rich evidence collected on the basis of a formal approach on the basis of the dialectical methodology





required by the period, for which the necessary conditions were created. For example, by the 1970s, the formal stage of Uzbek linguistics had been completed, and science had fulfilled its huge social task of developing and inculcating literary language norms in the public mind. At the next stage of succession, a strong foundation was laid for the study of the rich evidence collected on the basis of a formal approach on the basis of the dialectical methodology required by the period, for which the necessary conditions were created. Linguistics, for example, was, as mentioned above, overworked and in a state of stagnation. This necessitated the emergence of new problems, their causes and the search for ways to overcome these causes. One of the ways to solve these problems is “Uzbek linguistics was set in the 30s and 40s and in the 40s and 50s - a perfect description of the Uzbek language in modern analytical methods of different levels, the established literary language norms, textbooks for different stages of education, textbooks and dictionaries to create a complete theoretical understanding, commonalities in features, the essence of events, to rise to the level of revealing the cause in the consequences, the opportunity in the realities.” Hence, a one-dimensional analysis of the evaluation of language units was a social necessity for the transition from horizontal linear analysis to vertical linear analysis. It is true that a one-dimensional analysis that studies language units horizontally is not without a degree of vertical one-dimensional analysis, in which there have also been instances of language units being observed in certain paradigmatic rows. However, since the main focus was on revealing, clarifying, describing, and explaining the relationship of units in speech, sentence structure, the study of paradigmatic (vertical) relationships was a priority. For example, the analysis of the relationships between the constituent units of a particular phonetic system, lexical-semantic group, morphological paradigms were less important than the analysis of their meaning and functions in speech and speech. This is determined by the fact that their combinatorial relations are more important than the inter-systemic relations of the concepts called nominative units. The vertical one-dimensional analysis of linguistic phenomena is the study of systematic relationships between paradigm members. For example, “the historical need to use language in a practical way, to increase the efficiency of its social function, to define national and cultural codes, to open common linguistic possibilities that enable language algorithms, modeling, harmonization with information technology, was the result of social order requirements. Their implementation is entrusted to the successor of traditional Uzbek linguistics - Uzbek substantial linguistics, which is called "linguistics of possibilities". This linguistics conducted a systematic study of the distinction of linguistic and speech structures of





the Uzbek language, linguistic structure and linguistic units, their capabilities, examined the phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactic linguistic structures and units of language on the basis of dialectical research methodology. The results of the examination were formulated as dissertations and monographs. In education, the transition from teaching modern Uzbek literary language (a type of speech) to teaching the linguistic structure of modern Uzbek. The course "Modern Uzbek Literary Language", which is used in higher education and means a literary speech, which is not a name but a form of language, has the nature of "Modern Uzbek", which includes a description of the linguistic structure of the language. It should be noted with pride that even substantial laws (for example, linguistic hierarchy) discovered in the study of the linguistic structure of the Uzbek language are widely used today in corpus analysis studies, which is one of the priorities of Western linguistics (Germany). It seems that the achievements of the second stage of linear analysis of language units in Uzbek linguistics are a necessary step towards the analysis of the realization of these features. Also, the concept of inheritance can not be interpreted in any way other than the principle of "yesterday and today", but also the principle of "today and the future." After all, if the problems studied in linguistics yesterday include some buds of today's problems, the solution of the problems studied in today's areas of linguistics can be achieved at a future stage of linguistics. The main source of cognitive learning of language in the bil-dimensional formal phase of the study of language phenomena is the sharp differentiation of the categories of meaning and concept. This differentiation and differentiation ultimately leads to a differentiation of meaning and concept. Indeed, the set of meanings of language units constitutes the spiritual field of language, which is located below the concept, differs from it in its tendency to comprehensiveness and variability, dynamics, and with it the concept of language as a unit of thinking. Concept and meaning, whichever way you look at it, are cognitive in nature. Just as meaning is formed on the basis of a concept, meaning is the "core" of a concept's "core". Meaning is a component of a concept that is a unit of thought, gaining a certain relative independence from the concept in that it is more closely related to the phonetic image of the word and is specific to the communicative task. Formal linguistics also distinguished its lexicographic meanings from word meanings. Of course, there is no boundary between the meaning of a word (sememe) and its lexicographic meaning. When it comes to concept, the lexicographic meanings of words are taken into account more than the linguistic meaning. Just as any linguistic sign expresses the linguistic meaning in the communicative process, so the concept as an ideal, spiritual-intellectual phenomenon is formed in the communicative process and emerges in this process on the basis of the means of





language. In a particular case, the word embodies the multifaceted and multidimensional concept of the relevant aspects for this communicative process. Thus, the meaning of the word is the "responsibility" to reflect the aspects of the concept that are necessary and relevant for communication and information. In general, meaning-based nouns and communicative units are the means of materializing a concept.

It is known that the concept is realized by means of the meanings which are constituents of the following means:

- 1) using lexical meaning;
- 2) with the help of nominal meanings of free compounds;
- 3) with the help of sentences;
- 4) using text.

Among them, the lexical meaning that emerges in the structure of lexical-phraseological nomema occupies a central place. In any case, a phrase, a sentence, and a text cannot express their noun or communicative function without meaning or without reliance on it. In this sense, as N.N. Boldyrev noted, "the structure and content of various concepts *выявляюtsya* через *значения языковых единиц, репрезентирующих данный concept, их словарные толкования, речевые context.*" The concept is in harmony with the semantic categories of linguistic units (lexical meaning, value, content) in one way or another and with imaginations, concepts, associations, images and other mental concepts that serve to materialize themselves. In this sense, one-dimensional analysis, which was the first scientific step into the semantic structure of words, became a source of cognitive research of linguistic phenomena in exchange for strict delimitation of words and concepts, clarification of The concept, which occupies the necessary link between meaning and concept, reflects the "intermediate third" law of dialectical logic. Therefore, the clarification of the relationship of meaning and concept in the process of one-dimensional analysis has laid the foundation for the conceptual study of linguistic phenomena. It is well known that it is a form and unity of thinking that is understood and reflects important features, connections and relationships of events, their similarities and differences. It should be noted at this point that the signs of the phenomena of being are reflected both in concept, in concept, and in meaning. However, this reflection represents different forms of generalization. If the concept reflects the important features and characteristics of the phenomena of existence, communication and relationships, then in the sense this hierarchy is at the "most important" level. By itself, the concept manifests itself in the form of "important and unimportant". Concept, like meaning and concept, is a product of knowledge and a source of





knowledge and has a hierarchical structure. Just as differentiation and generalization are necessary conditions for knowing, difference and generality are general differences of both concept and concept. General concepts and scientific-field concepts correspond to common words and terms. Concepts are generated using logical methods such as comparison, analysis, synthesis, abstraction, generalization, with or without purpose. Concept is inextricably linked with meaning. The asymmetric relationship of thought and language is reflected in the relationship of perception and speech. In many cases, it was customary to compare and contrast concepts and words. The word is the same form, the same image for both concept and meaning. Concepts are expressed both verbally and with other adjective units when the word is insufficient. Seeing a word and a concept in a relationship is definitely more accurate when the meaning of the word is meant. However, the versatility of the word, its nomenclature (phonetic structure of the lexeme) and its application to and semema, which differ in structural linguistics as a term, cause some inconvenience and ambiguity in looking at them as a concept and concept. It is therefore important to note that when it comes to the relationship between word and concept, word and concept, meaning is meant. In general, the formal phase of the linear study of language units has created one of the scientific sources for the analysis of linguistic phenomena, particularly text, in the cognitive aspect, by delimiting the categories of words (meanings) and concepts, defining their commonalities and differences, clarifying categorical and principal differences between events.

References

1. Ne'matov H., Bozorov O. Language and speech. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1993. - B.4.
2. Mengliev B. Linguistics: necessity and tradition // Ma'rifat, 2012, November 19
3. Boldyrev N.N. Kontseptualnoe prostranstvo kognitivnoy lingvistiki // Voprosy kognitivnoy lingvistiki. 2004. №1. –S. 18–37.
4. Ganiev, A. G. (2021). "The Corpuscular Theory of Light." "The Corpuscular Nature of Light" Mind Map. In Педагогика И Современное Образование: Традиции, Опыт И Инновации (Pp. 21-23).
5. Ganiev, A. G. (2021). Exploration of Alisher Navai's "Khamsa" With A Mind Map. Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (Turcomat), 12(4), 37-42.
6. G'aniyev, A. G. (2018). Physics: 1 part. T. "Editor, 3-5.
7. Kerimov, B. K., Ehl'gavkhari, A. I., & Ganiev, A. G. (1981). P-odd polarization phenomena in the electron-positron pair photoproduction in the nucleus field. Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Fiz. ;(USSR), 45(11).





8. Mamatov, M. (2021). Spiritual Enlargement - The Base of the Country's Evolution. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 2(10), 25-29. <https://doi.org/10.47494/cajipc.v2i10.213>

