

## “CONCEPTUAL SEMANTICS OF HYPERBOLE” AND LINGUOKOGNITIVE AREA OF VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL MEANS IMPLEMENTING IT

Kholmukhammad Khusanov,

Independent Researcher of Andijan State Medical Institute

phone:998 99 852 19 08

e-mail Kholmuxusanov1990g@mail.com

### ABSTRACT

The article deals with the issue of the theory of modern cognitive grammar (linguistics), which is an objective world based on cognitive-semantic categories, significant stable (constant) units, invariants, or "cognitive-semantic constants" in linguistics, or "concepts" with a universal (international) description. It is believed that there is a great need and need to determine the total number of cognitive-semantic categories that should be implemented in each language, which is directly related to the categorization of the knowledge system. Also, general linguistic realities are investigated in the conceptualization and categorization of the system of verbal knowledge, conceptual constants or linguocognitive constants, i.e. constant, stable phenomena and aspects in thinking and in language, which are of a universal nature.

**Keywords:** conceptualization, categorization, cognitive, framework, microconcept, macroconcept, homoconcept, heteroconcept, COH, verbal, nonverbal.

### INTRODUCTION

In the perception of the objective world, feelings, intuitions, imaginations, thoughts, ideas, concepts about it are cognitive (or conceptual) in thinking through two important inseparable mental processes, that is, conceptualization and categorization processes, that is, perceptual semantics or it is natural that it is embodied in “concepts” and directly expressed through language elements, i.e. verbal tools (verbalizers, actualizers, representatives). From this point of view, in the opinion of the well-known linguist Sh. Safarov, “in order to know the role of language in the activity of thinking, the relationship between consciousness and language should not be considered as a simple case (phenomenon). This relationship is a mutual “dialogue” of two independent events. The same dialogue leads to the linguisticization of mental activity, since linguistic and logical activities accompany each other and form a single speech thinking process”. (Safarov 2006,14 b.).

When talking about the term “semantics”, it should be fundamentally distinguished from “content”, and “content” from “meaning”. By “semantics” we understand the typical “ma’no” in Uzbek, “значение” in Russian, or “meaning” in English. The content is the actualization (materialization) of semantics (meaning) in a concrete situation in speech [1].

It can be seen that semantics is general and has an international nature. In fact, it is divided into two main types: 1) “conceptual (or cognitive) semantics” (Jackendoff 1993,37) it is abstract mental perceptual semantics in thinking. 2) “linguistic semantics”, although this semantics is precisely the result of the above-mentioned perceptual semantics being made an event through language. In this sense, it is no hyperbole to say that perceptual semantics is a property of thinking. Thus, perceptual semantics as conceptual semantics forms the philosophical and

logical basis of linguistic (language) semantics. They are types of semantics that require each other, conceptual semantics is primary, and linguistic semantics is secondary, and as a result of mental and perceptual processes in thinking, it is considered to be their direct product in language, and directly in language through verbal tools (verbalizers) will be realized. But there is no reason to say that the concept or conceptual semantics in the language is always completely and fully expressed through linguistics, because in our opinion, there are not enough verbalizers to express all aspects of this concept in the language [2].

It is worth saying that conceptual semantics, in turn, forms the direct cognitive basis of the concept in thinking. It is possible to put an equal sign between them, but in any case, the concept serves as a framed superstructure of conceptual semantics, and not its opposite. It is worth noting that several closely related conceptual semantics- “macroconcept”, while “paired concepts” and their “homoconcept” scientists also expressed important opinions about the species (Khoshimov 2014, p. 392-393).

Therefore, it would not be wrong to say that conceptual semantics or a concept is the final result of certain conceptual and categorical (differentiation, comparison, and sorting ) process in thinking, because it (the concept) is the only means of perceiving the world and is a direct consequence of conceptualization, categorization, and a number of other similar complex process, although when a certain part of the objective entity is perceived at one level or another, it becomes conceptual semantics, or embodied as concept(s) and directly embodied through the means of language.

From the above comments, it is logically correct to conclude that “the linguistic realization of the concept that occurs as a unit of thought and a mental phenomenon is also the result of speech thinking activity” (Safarov 2006, 18 )

It should be noted that “the perception of the material world requires the creation of an understanding of the perceived object –phenomena, and later this understanding is formed as a mental model –concept and receives a material name [3]. Linguistic memory plays the main role in the result (whether the result is successful or unsuccessful) of this type of multi-level linguistic-psychic activity” (Safarov 2006,18), so in this sense, the “linguosphere” of the speaker of the language and linguistic, naturally, also plays an important role (Khoshimov 2014, p. 392-393)

It is known that phoneme (phonomorpheme), morpheme, lexeme, syntaxeme (phraseme, sentenceme), (Khoshimov 2014,p.391), phraseological units and textemas (discourses) are widely used. Existing integrated units, that is, language tools- are emic units, and at the same time, they are verbalizers that express conceptual semantics (concepts) in language in the human thinking-conceptosphere. When they are used (represented) in concrete speech, they ultimately become ethical units such as background, morphophone, morph, lex, phrase, sentence, idiom (phraseological unit) and text [4].

It is worth noting that this or that concept can be expressed through the units of certain language levels, and some of them can be expressed through the language units of all the existing language levels listed above. In the first case, we are dealing with “micro-concepts”, and in the second case with “macro-concepts”, while conceptual semantics related to physiological and psychological situations directly related to the human way of life constitute

macro-concepts, and they are units of all levels of language can be realized through. Such macroconcepts include the “hyperbole concept”, that is, hyperbole conceptual semantics. (HCS) Thus, the “hyperbole concept” or HCS has a universal nature, and each language, including the comparable English, Uzbek and Russian languages, specific verbal and non-verbal tools (gesture, face, head, eyebrow(s), lips, eye(s), nose and other organs and body movements), although in linguistics such verbal devices are generally referred to as “verbalizer” (or “representative”, “actualizer”, are called “objectifiers”), and non-verbal means are called “paralinguistic means” (Kolshansky 1998,21) more precisely, paralinguistic verbalizers.

The universal nature of “hyperbole” is related to such an important factor that its linguo-cognitive basis, “hyperbole conceptual semantics” (HCS), exists in the thinking of every sane person who speaks/writes the language, namely is a perceptual phenomenon that is standardized by the received society, and therefore expressed in the conceptsphere of society, and such semantics cannot be legitimately manifested in any living language through a special system of specific, verbal and non-verbal means [5]. Thus, any cognitive/conceptual semantics must be expressed through verbal means [6], although such semantics, depending on the communication situation, can be partially expressed through non-verbal (nonverbal) means, more precisely, “paralinguistic means” [7] possible.

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In conclusion, it can be said that hyperbole, antihyperbole, lithota, meiosis, gradation, antigradation, climax, anticlimax and grotesques are related to the description of objects in life or increase (enlargement) or decrease (reduction), their main difference is that hyperbole, in antihyperbole and grotesque, there is always an exaggeration (reduction,weakening) of a certain description, while lithota and meiosis have a simple, usual reduction semantics, but “exaggeration” has no semantics. Ultimately, their combination gives us “antihypermeiosis” and “antihyperlithota”, which should be considered new “mixed (syncretic)” stylistic devices.

### REFERENCES

1. Григорьев В.П. “Материалы к словарю паронимов русского языка”. М.: ИРЯз РАН, 1992. – 47 с.
2. Хошимов Ғ.М. “К теории концептов и их таксономии в когнитивной лингвистике” // “Систем-структур тилшунослик муаммолари”. 2010. Б. 68-69
3. Сафаров Ш.С. “Когнитив тилшунослик”. - Жиззах, “Сангзор” нашриёти, 2006. 92 -б.
4. Сафаров Ш.С. “Когнитив тилшунослик”. - Жиззах, “Сангзор” нашриёти 2006, Б.-16.
5. Карабоев Ж.Б. “Лингвокультурологические особенности вербализаторов концептуальной семантики “гипербола” в языках разной типологической принадлежности”//Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. 2015, 74-75).
6. Jackendoff . Semantics and Cognition . 6th ed. Cambridge Mass. The MIT Press. 1993, P.137 -283
7. Колшанский В.Г. Логика и структура языка . Лингвистическое наследие 20 века. URSS2005, С. 24
8. Ахманова О.С. “Словарь лингвистических терминов”. 1999, С.-412.



9. Ш.Жўраев. “Санъатим”, “Ўзбекистон Миллий Энциклопедияси”, 233-б. 57 б.
10. Хошимов Ғ.М., Абдурахимова Н.К. “Лингвокультурологические особенности номинативных видов вербализаторов гендерной концептуальной семантики в английском и узбекском языках”. ФарДУ-илмий хабарлар №3, 2020. 144-148 б.