



**CONCEPTUALIZATION AND THE CONCEPTUAL FIELD IN
LINGUOCULTURAL RESEARCH**

Mukhammadiyarov Aydos Joldasbaevich,
PhD student of Nukus State Pedagogical Institute
aydmuxam@mail.ru

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15201049>

Annotation. *This article explores the theoretical foundations of conceptual field analysis in linguocultural studies. It examines key definitions and approaches, drawing upon the work of prominent scholars such as Kubryakova, Ashurova & Galieva, Langacker, and Keesing. The analysis encompasses the study of concepts organized by shared features, the construction of cognitive maps, and the role of metaphorical conceptualization in revealing national-cultural and general mental characteristics. The article identifies key elements of the conceptual field, including non-equivalent lexicon, culturally specific phraseology, stylistic devices that characterize culture, mythologemes, and culturally specific concepts. It emphasizes the interconnectedness of linguistic elements and their function in conveying meaning, highlighting the importance of both grammatical and metaphorical analysis for understanding the cognitive underpinnings of language and culture. Finally, the study notes the hierarchical structure of metaphorical equivalence, progressing from general to specific, within conceptual fields.*

Key words: *conceptual field, cognitive map, conceptualization, linguocultural element, model, metaphorization.*

Introduction. The conceptual field is inextricably linked to the notion of conceptual analysis. According to E.S. Kubryakova's definition, conceptual analysis encompasses the study of concepts brought together under a common feature, examining the existence of a sign as a cognitive structure that provides knowledge about everything. Based on these concept definitions, it is possible to construct a "cognitive map" of the word, which entails, first, the data of the most frequently used words; second, a description of all paths of semantically shifting words; and third, a more complete understanding of the lexicographical portrait of the word.¹

Main part. D.U. Ashurova and M.R. Galieva suggested that "the interpretation of an individual author's entire imagery encompasses three groups: content analysis, stylistic analysis, and conceptual analysis." Furthermore, distinguishing between these three, they associate conceptual analysis with the author's method of conceptualizing their imaginary world. Conceptual analysis, grounded in content and stylistic analyses, reveals the author's viewpoint and their unique method of reflecting

¹Кубрякова Е. С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира / Рос. академия наук. Ин-т языкознания. — М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. — 560 с. — (Язык. Семиотика. Культура).



XORIJIY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

imaginary reality in their consciousness.² These scholars also specify the objects of study within conceptual analysis.

- a) Non-equivalent lexicon;
- b) Culturally specific phraseological units: proverbs and sayings, quotations, epigrams;
- c) Stylistic devices that characterize culture (allusions, antonomasia, litotes, euphemisms, image-creating stylistic devices);
- d) Mythologemes;
- e) Culturally specific concepts.³

Scholars approach such field analysis from various perspectives. For instance, R.W. Langacker was among the first to introduce the term "conceptualization" into linguistics, emphasizing the significance of "cognitive grammar" in the explicit linguistic representation of human consciousness. Indeed, grammatical analysis is exceedingly important for conceptual analysis. In grammar, abstracted away from the details of individual expressions, we see clearly mental operations that pervade all of their content. This often involves a simulation of aspects of everyday life—activating inherent actions and expanded other states in conceptual archetypes.⁴ Thus, it implies that, by examining these linguocultural elements grammatically, one can, to some extent, recognize the cognitive capacity of a people.

Several scholars suggest that the metaphorization of conceptual field units is one of the best methods for identifying national-cultural and general mental peculiarities. Roger M. Keesing states that "languages identify a hierarchical structure of metaphors, which serves to reveal areas that are close to experienced bodies and experience oriented toward perception of space and movement, and less explored areas. The hierarchy of metaphorical equivalence moves from the general to the specific."⁵ (See Diagram 1).



²Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Cultural linguistics. – Tashkent, 2019. – p 50.

³There – p 50.

⁴Ronald W. Langacker. Cognitive grammar: a basic introduction. Oxford University Press, 2008. – p 539-540.

⁵Roger M. Keesing. Radical cultural difference: Anthropology's myth?//Language contact and language conflict edited by Martin Pütz, University of Duisburg. John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994. p. 3-25.



XORIJIY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's (2003) "Metaphors We Live By" was a groundbreaking work that revolutionized the field of linguistics through the concept of "conceptual metaphor" and significantly shaped numerous language theories. It elucidates how humans interact with concepts in everyday life, how metaphorical concepts are systematic, and how concepts in human consciousness possess metaphorical qualities. In general, the human conceptual system connects all concepts in the conceptual field with metaphors. For example, in the syntactic unit (SU) "Argument is War," the meaning is not about actual warfare; rather, the discussion concerns the explicit (literal) and implicit (figurative) nature of meaning. Consequently, the conceptual structure in the human mind is linked to a metaphorical framework arising from the interaction of the physical and imaginary worlds.⁶

Ray Jackendoff gives particular attention to issues related to language semantics (conceptual semantics), knowledge about the world, and the human mind. In his book "Semantics and Cognition," he distinguishes three types of questions for a theory of semantics: those pertaining to the nature of meaning, its relation to language, and its relation to the world.⁷

The conceptual field, encompassing linguistic semantics and conceptual metaphorical essence, includes conceptual analysis units, progressing from the general to the particular, and is considered the cornerstone of conceptual analysis. It represents the structural form of the content image: "referring to the peculiarities of the word related to the true history and its life in the language; artistic peculiarities actualized through partnership with one or another, I know they create a semantic field anyway; valuable peculiarities, this, of course, subtly and clearly depicts the spiritual qualities of the ethnos."⁸ Accordingly, Michalchuk introduces the term "conceptual model," noting its similar characteristics to the conceptual field.⁹

The conceptual field can consist of concepts, lexical-semantic subunits, conceptospheres, notions, segments, and more.

The conceptual field is a complex form of mental development, combining several constituent parts, enabling the reflection in the minds of speakers of a particular language of the comprehensively actualized content and structure of the communicatively relevant part of a concept. Analyzing concept content through

⁶George Lakoff, Mark Johnsen. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, London: The university of Chicago press, 1980. – 242 p.

⁷Jackendoff, R. *Semantics and cognition//The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*. 1996. -p 539-559.

⁸Пименова М.В. Образные и символические признаки луны в русской концептосфере // Концепт и культура. Материалы III Международной конференции. Кемерово: Кузбассвузиздат, 2008. С. 294–295.

⁹Михальчук И.П. Концептуальные модели в семантической реконструкции (индоевропейское понятие «закон») // Известия РАН. 1997. Т. 56. № 4. С. 29.



XORIJY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

linguistic data provides rich and reliable, as well as verifiable, material for revealing concepts.¹⁰ The elements of the field possess a mental character, and mentality is associated with the people's consciousness, which equally incorporates history and the present. Therefore, it possesses the following functions:

1. The field denotes the inventory of elements that are interconnected through systematic relationships.
2. The elements constituting the field possess semantic commonality and perform a unified function in the language.
3. The field unites both homogeneous and heterogeneous elements.
4. The field is generated from its constituent parts.
5. The field possesses both vertical and horizontal organization.
6. The field consists of core and peripheral components.
7. Adjacent fields overlap with one another, forming a continuous transition zone. This represents a regularity in the field organization of the language system.¹¹

Conclusion. In summary, the conceptual field, as a framework for linguistic analysis, provides a valuable lens for understanding how meaning is organized and expressed within a language. This framework emphasizes the interconnectedness of linguistic elements, their shared semantic properties, and their unified function in conveying meaning. The field is not a monolithic entity but rather a complex system composed of both similar and diverse elements, arranged in a hierarchical structure with core and peripheral components. Moreover, the boundaries between conceptual fields are not rigid, but rather characterized by overlapping zones, reflecting the dynamic and fluid nature of language itself. By recognizing these key features of the conceptual field, researchers can gain deeper insights into the cognitive and cultural underpinnings of linguistic expression. This approach allows one to not only recognize elements, but to also see their connection.

References:

1. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Cultural linguistics. – Tashkent, 2019. – p 50.
2. George Lakoff, Mark Johnsen. Metaphors we live by. Chicago, London: The university of Chicago press, 1980. – 242 p.
3. Jackendoff, R. Semantics and cognition//The handbook of contemporary semantic theory. 1996. -p 539-559.
4. Кубрякова Е. С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира / Рос. академия наук. Ин-т языкознания. — М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. — 560 с. — (Язык. Семиотика. Культура).

¹⁰Карасик В.И., Стернин И.А. Антология концептов. Волгоград: Парадигма, 2005. Т. 1. С.3.

¹¹ Зубарева Е.О., Шустова С.В., Исаева Е.В. Концептуальное поле в современной лингвистической парадигме//Научный журнал № 3, 2019. С.19.



XORIY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

5. Карасик В.И., Стернин И.А. Антология концептов. Волгоград: Парадигма, 2005. Т. 1. С.3.
6. Михальчук И.П. Концептуальные модели в семантической реконструкции (индоевропейское понятие «закон») // Известия РАН. 1997. Т. 56. № 4. С. 29.
7. Пименова М.В. Образные и символические признаки луны в русской концептосфере // Концепт и культура. Материалы III Международной конференции. Кемерово: Кузбассвуиздат, 2008. С. 294–295.
8. Ronald W. Langacker. Cognitive grammar: a basic introduction. Oxford University Press, 2008. – p 539-540.
9. Roger M. Keesing. Radical cultural difference: Anthropology's myth?//Language contact and language conflict edited by Martin Pütz, University of Duisburg. John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994. p. 3-25.