

Features of The Study of Conceptual Units In Literary Texts

Rizayeva Zarnigor Ikramovna

Teacher of the department of Spanish and Italian Languages,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. Literature concept is considered, first of all, as a unity of individual mind of the field of concept verbally expressed in a single text of the writer's work. It is noted that the nature and methods of expressing the national concept in the literature world of a certain author determine the characteristics of his individual concept. It was found that the use of a certain method of analysis of literature concepts largely depends on the studied object (a specific author, a specific literature text), as well as the type of the studied concept.

Keywords: Literature text, concept, modern tasks, language, speech, cultural experience.

Introduction. In modern linguistics, only in recent years have literary concepts become the subject of close attention, although in general the analysis of a literary text from a conceptual point of view already has a fairly strong tradition in domestic linguistics. The domestic tradition in the study of concepts was laid by S.A. Askoldov (1928), who proposed a psychological approach to this phenomenon, emphasizing its subjective nature: a concept is "a mental formation that replaces for us in the process of thought an indefinite set of objects of the same kind". The author distinguishes between cognitive ("buds of the most complex inflorescences of mental concreteness") and literary concepts ("a combination of concepts, ideas, feelings, emotions, volitional manifestations"). The presence of "literary associativity, alien to logic and real pragmatics" is recognized as the most significant difference between the literature concept and the cognitive one.

Literature review and methodology. Based on the linguocultural understanding of the concept, D.S. Likhachev, in his article "The Conceptosphere of Language," claims that this phenomenon is "a hint of possible meanings," "their algebraic expression." The scientist emphasizes the importance of "individual cultural experience, stock of knowledge and skills," the wealth of which directly determines the richness of the concept. Thus, D.S. Likhachev proceeds from a linguoculturological understanding of the concept: it arises as a "response to a person's previous language experience." The scientist pays special attention to the relationship of this phenomenon with the meaning of the word. "The concept not only replaces the meaning of the word and thereby eliminates disagreements in understanding the meaning of the word, it to a certain extent expands the meaning, leaving opportunities for co-creation, conjecture, for the emotional aura of the word" [2.4]. Thanks to D.S. Likhachev is also that he emphasizes the interconnection of concepts and introduces the concept of the concept sphere. In addition to the personal concept sphere, the author identifies the

concept sphere of the national language, which is correlated “with the entire historical experience of the nation and especially religion” [2.5].

The linguocultural understanding of the concept is reflected in the works of V.V. Kolesova, Yu.S. Stepanova, V.I. Karasika, N.F. Alefirenko, S.G. Vorkacheva. According to Kolesov, the concept is “the starting point of the semantic content of a word” - in the course of its historical development is consistently transformed into an image, concept and symbol, turning into a cultural concept in its modern form. The scientist states: “The concept therefore becomes the reality of national speech thought, figuratively given in the word, because it really exists, just as there is a language, phoneme, morpheme and other “noumena” of content identified by science that are vital to any culture. A concept is something that is not subject to change in the semantics of a verbal sign, which, on the contrary, dictates to speakers of a given language, determining their choice, directs their thought, creating the potential possibilities of language-speech” [3.36]. The author notes that the concept “has no form, because it is “internal form” (term by A.A. Potebnya) [3.37]. Kolesov develops his ideas in a later work [4]. The scientist considers the main features of the concept to be constancy of existence, literary imagery, semantic syncretism, universal binding for all carriers of a given culture, and integration into the system of ideal components of culture [4.157-158]. Thus, the scientist turns first of all to the history of the language, emphasizing the gradual formation of this phenomenon in the culture of the people.

For this study, the opinion of I.A. Tarasova is also of interest, who considers the literature concept, first of all, as a unit of “individual” consciousness of the concept sphere, verbalized in a single text of the writer’s work. The scientist models the author’s concepts on the basis of semantic-stylistic, contextual, field, component, structural, comparative, lexicographical nature, “resulting in a conceptual analysis of the key units ... of the ideosphere...” [5.77-78].

Discussion and results. Moreover, according to L.V. Miller, literature concepts can be represented in the individual consciousness and the collective unconscious as “specific cognitive structures (ideal semantic conglomerates)” in one form or another. The identification of “semantic transformations” in the space of the text predetermines the possibility of reconstructing the concept, thereby revealing its essence, which unites “consciousness, language and national aesthetic tradition” [6.4]. Thus, “a concept can be considered as an “ideal signified” belonging to consciousness, which has linguistic and extra-linguistic dimensions” [6.16]. L.V. Miller’s opinion that the concept belongs “not only to individual consciousness, but also to the psychomental sphere of the entire ethnocultural community” is consonant with the ideas of N.V. Fominykh:

- “...literary texts of a particular author, taken together, make it possible to draw certain conclusions about the conceptual sphere of the people whose representative is the author, whose texts are the material for the study” [7. 177].

It should be noted that the analysis of a literary text allows us to talk about a unique relationship between the concept and the work of art. On the one hand, the concept is the key for adequate perception of the content of the work and its emotional and evaluative information due to the ethnoculturally determined aesthetic and semantic code contained in the concept. Deciphering the meaning of a work is facilitated by the associative and connotative components of the concept’s content [6. 5;15].

On the other hand, we can talk about the representation of the concept and the individual concept sphere in a literary text. The nature and ways of representing a national concept in the literary

world of a particular author determine the characteristics of his individual concept sphere. Often the content of the concept is enriched with individual increments of a substantive and pragmatic nature.

The human mental lexicon is a conceptual system consisting of various kinds of concepts and conceptual structures, and various units claim the role of generic definition. Thus, Lakoff spoke about varieties of *gestalts*, which, in his opinion, could be linguistic, mental, perceptual, motor, or even mixed, for example, sensory-motor [8. 360].

Thus, in a literary text, which is the result of verbal and mental activity, the author verbalizes his conceptual picture of the world. Based on this, based on cognitive analysis of a literary text, it is possible to reconstruct a model of the author's conceptual picture of the world or identify fragments of its content - concepts. Therefore, it is "the perception of texts as a sequence of signs that allows us to use the "standards" (standards) accepted in the linguocultural community for the transition from linguistic expressions to the denotations they denote..." [10. 186].

Modern science, when studying a literary text or the language of an individual author, increasingly considers the concept within the framework of *idiostyle*. According to V.V. Ledeneva, *idiostyle* reveals itself as a result of the text-generating and aesthetic activity of a linguistic personality, therefore it is reflected in the integration of preferred themes, genres, means and techniques necessary for constructing a text and transmitting both informative and emotive-expressive components. The researcher believes that when selecting means to express his idea, the author is guided by a subjective category of preference, and this determines the individual nature of the *idiostyle*, its difference from the *idiostyles* of other writers. Under the *idiolect* of V.V. Ledeneva understands "an individualized "version" of the national language." The peculiarity of the *idiolect* and *idiostyle* is expressed in the author's use of stylistically colored and uncodified vocabulary, in word creation, in the development of preferred overtones of meaning and in the formation of new concepts at the text level. In his definition of *idiostyle*, the author emphasizes the hierarchical nature of the relationship between *idiolect* and *idiostyle*:

- "idiostyle is a system of relationships individually established by a linguistic personality to various methods of self-representation by means of *idiolect*" [11. 38-40].

The communicative model of text generation creates a methodological basis for interpreting a text on a linguistic basis: here *idiostyle* is interpreted through a system of associative semantic fields of a literary text. These fields are the basis for the construction of literary speech, which can serve as a source for identifying the content of the concept [9. 237].

Understanding I.A. Tarasova *idiostyle* as "the unity of mental and linguistic - concepts and cognitive structures and their linguistic embodiment" determines, according to the researcher, the modern tasks of describing *idiostyle* in its correlation:

- 1) with the concept of a concept (not reducible to the concept of personal meaning);
- 2) with models of speech generation in the direction from cognitive phenomena to their linguistic implementation;
- 3) with further clarification of the question of the ontological status of literary reality.

I.A. Tarasova also emphasizes that from the point of view of cognitive science, "idiostyle can be considered as a system of means of expression that correlates the writer's inner world (literary worldview, mental world) with literary reality, the literary world of the text, created by poetic

language. The mental world can be interpreted in cognitive terminology as an individual poetic concept sphere, or the author's conceptual system" [5. 14].

A very important point related to the study of concepts is the methodology for their analysis. So, I.A. Tarasova proposes to distinguish conceptual, objective, associative, figurative and symbolic layers of the concept. L.V. Miller reduces conceptual analysis to "a description of the linguistic implementations of a concept and the reconstruction of its content on this basis." Particular attention is paid to the typological method (identification of the basic semantic and emotional-evaluative components of literature concepts, which allows us to consider the concept as an intentional object in the mind of the subject and the collective consciousness of the linguocultural community) and the method of comparing genetically identical literary statements. E.S. Kubryakova focuses on the difference between semantic analysis, associated with the explanation of the word, and conceptual analysis, leading to knowledge about the world.

At the same time, it should be noted that the use of a particular methodology for analyzing literature concepts largely depends on the object of study (a specific author, a specific literary text), as well as on the type of concept that is being studied.

REFERENCES:

1. Askoldov S.A. Concept and word // literature. From the theory of literature to text structure. Anthology. M.: Academia, 2007. pp. 267-279.
2. Likhachev D.S. Conceptosphere of language // News of Academy of Sciences. Ser. lit. and language 2003. pp. 4-10.
3. Kolesov V.V. The concept of culture: image – concept – symbol // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 2. 2002. Issue. 3 (16). pp. 30-40.
4. Kolesov V.V. "Life comes from the word..." St. Petersburg: Zlatoust, 2009.
5. Tarasova I.A. Idiostyle of Georgy Ivanov: cognitive aspect. Saratov: Publishing house Saratov. University, 2003.
6. Miller L.V. Linguistic and cognitive mechanisms for the formation of an literary picture of the world (based on literature): abstract of thesis. dis. ... Dr. Philol. Sci. St. Petersburg, 2004.
7. Fominykh N.V. Concept, conceptor and literary text // Methodological problems of cognitive linguistics. 2001. pp. 176-179.
8. Lakoff J. Linguistic gestalts // New in foreign linguistics. 2001. Issue. 10. pp. 350-368.
9. Shapilova N.I. Associative-semantic field as the basis for reconstructing the content of a concept // The World of Man and the World of Language. Ser. Conceptual studies. Kemerovo, 2003. Issue. 2. pp. 237-245.
10. Akhidzhakova M.P. Intercultural foundations in the textual aspect of modern linguistics // Bulletin of the Adygea State University. Ser. Philology and art history. 2012. Issue. 1 (96). pp. 182-187.
11. Ledeneva V.V. Idiostyle (to clarify the concept) // Philological Sciences. 2001. 5. P. 36-41.
12. Kubryakova E.S. About one fragment of the conceptual analysis of the word MEMORY // Logical analysis of language. Cultural concepts. M.: Nauka, 1991. pp. 85-91.