Jafarova U. N.
Azerbaijan Medical University

MODERN LINGUISTICS AND ITS DEFINING PRINCIPLES

The article is devoted to modern linguistics and its defining principle. Cognitivists associate grammar, that is, the grammatical structure of language, and even the phonetic system, with cognitive essence. True, they themselves note that it is extremely difficult to show traces of the meaning of the world in sounds and grammatical patterns. But at the same time they do not deny the possibility of this. The main and fundamental postulates of cognitive linguistics are When it is done, it becomes clear that language as a whole determines the uniqueness of the people's consciousness in the perception of the world. It is precisely language that stands between the people's consciousness and the world and plays a kind of intermediary role. Language encodes and preserves knowledge about the world. Modern linguistics, which has such an attitude towards language and sees the main function of language in the assimilation and encoding of knowledge, brings to the fore the problem of epistemology. Epistemology is a term derived from the Greek root episteme and means "scientific knowledge", "true knowledge". Naturally, cognitive linguistics should pay special attention to the problem of epistemology, since cognitivism, as a general scientific direction, brings to the fore the problem of cognitive patterns. The basis of the direction is the idea of cognition. Cognition consists of three stages, the first of which is familiarization with information, the second – the production of information, and, finally, the third – the presentation of information. All three stages and cognitivism as a whole are directly and closely related to the problem of epistemology. As is known, the basis of epistemology is the contradiction between scientific knowledge and ordinary opinion, in English, science and opinion. The main question of epistemology is: are people's ideas about life and the environment true or false? Is our knowledge of life true or false? In philosophical terms, the difference between empirical and rational knowledge is fundamental or not.

Key words: linguistics, knowledge, information, structuralism, cognition.

Introduction. The concept of modernity is determined by the relevance of the subject, not by time. Therefore, the current stage of linguistics is not determined by the concepts that have emerged today, but is concretized in connection with issues and problems that have not yet lost their relevance. From a theoretical point of view, the stable foundation of linguistics is still system-structural linguistics. According to sometimes expressed opinions, system-structural linguistics has given its position to cognitive linguistics today, and the stage created by system-structural linguistics has come to an end. At the same time, the traditional system-structural views that have been stabilized in linguistic consciousness constitute the theoretical platform of many studies even today [1]. In this regard, it should be noted that in fact it is not correct to equate system-structural linguistics with structuralism. On the other hand, the formation of cognitivism does not deny system-structural linguistics. It is necessary to dwell on these two points in some detail.

Structuralism refers to the definitive development of the ideas of F. de Saussure. This manifests itself in Danish glossematics, the Prague school of linguistics, and relatively consistently in American and English structuralism.

The purpose of the work is to show the basic principles of cognitive linguistics and the aspects that form it.

The main problem. When we talk about modern linguistics and want to determine Saussure's place in its theoretical context, the first thing that comes to mind is the separation of the phenomenal essence of language and speech. The sequential separation of these two phenomena is considered the first of the important dichotomies that distinguish Saussure's concept. It is very interesting that both in the past (that is, in our past after the "General Course in Linguistics") and today the language-speech dichotomy is universally accepted and confirmed as a scientific truth, but in specific studies the separation of these two phenomena is observed very rarely. From this it is possible to draw only one conclusion. So, separating language from speech and speech from language is not such an easy task. Yes, theoretical thought, built on logic, understands well that these two phenomena

have a different nature and essence. However, it seems that in the studies of specific linguistic facts, it is detrimental to researchers not to emphasize the issue of whether this or that fact belongs to language or speech. The main reason is that many theoretical issues cannot be resolved in specific studies. For this reason, scientists do not shy away from posing these problems, but do not provide their solutions either. Of course, the solution of theoretical problems does not directly affect the study of specific language or speech units, but determines the ideas about language as a whole [2].

The differentiation of language and speech units is theoretical in nature, this is beyond doubt. However, in terms of general results in the study of any language units, this at first glance abstract differentiation becomes extremely concrete. As is known, in the history of linguistics, the polemics that arose around proverbs actually arose around language and speech. Thus, it can be noted once again that the system-structural concept has not lost its importance today and has not been squeezed out of the context of modern linguistics. But it is also a fact that when most linguists say modern science, when they say modern trends in linguistics, they mean the anthropocentric paradigm and cognitive linguistics. The reason for this, in our opinion, is that cognitivism generally opposes structuralism. However, a very subtle point lies in the fact that this opposition is not definitive. In our opinion, cognitivism complements structuralism, does not deny it. The contradiction is clearly that structuralism proceeds from form and formal relations, and cognitivism from content and its national-cultural specificity. However, it is not correct to make this difference absolute. In fact, from a paradigmatic point of view, structuralism and cognitivism can form a single system within the framework of modern linguistics.

The possible harmony of structuralism and cognitivism in linguistics is a fact, but today it can be evaluated as a future perspective. Today, it is clear that cognitive linguistics is a younger paradigm than system-structural linguistics, and cognitivism in linguistics is still taking shape. As a natural consequence of this, cognitive linguistics avoids any "neighborhood" and tries to establish its own independence. As a result of concrete linguistic research, it is determined that cognitivism is the only language theory that reveals or is directed towards the peculiarities of national thinking and national psychology reflected in language. It should be noted that cognitive linguistics involves the language system as a whole as a material in research. Even

the cognitive essence of grammatical categories is set as a goal. However, at the same time, it is clear that there is relatively favorable language material for cognitive research. Naturally, in this regard, the lexical-semantic level is the most favorable layer for cognitivism. From the point of view of emotionality, of course, phraseological units are of great importance. As for paremiological units, in our opinion, they constitute the most important linguistic material for cognitive linguistics. If cognitive linguistics is to be understood as the intellectual reflection of the people in language, Literature If one is interested in practical experience, proverbs demonstrate this experience most vividly [3].

In fact, cognitivism is a general or interdisciplinary trend. According to some scientists, cognitivism unites various sciences. The goal is the same, and individual sciences study a single object – human cognition. Within the framework of general cognitive science, a person is studied as an information-producing system. The natural language studied in this way is explained as a way of perceiving the world of the people speaking that language. In general, cognitive linguistics understands natural language as the only intermediary between the world and man. Historically, in phylogenesis, language is formed under the influence of ethnic thinking and psychology, but after it is formed, it forms both mass and individual consciousness. That is, consciousness is educated under the strong influence of language. Thus, an important area of socialization is the formation of linguistic identity.

Cognitive linguistics has been able to create its scientific apparatus in recent years. Some terms constitute the terminological autonomy of cognitive linguistics, and the most important term in this regard is the concept term. If we look at various studies, we will see that it is the concept term that takes a central position here, and the analyses mainly revolve around it. This is completely logical, because if cognitive linguistics is interested in popular thinking, then it is the concept that presents the mass thinking of the people through language. When the essence of the concept is explained, it becomes clear that the most important event for a concept is verbalization. The term verbalization creates an almost constant association with the concept term. The reason for this is that the concept is understandable only at the verbal level. The main reasons for this are that the concept is a verbal event. That is, as a traditional logical term, a concept is also a mental event, but due to its universal nature, the concept includes all things that are generally called by a word. For example, the main features that make

a house a house, a building a building, constitute the concept of "house" or "building", and these concepts encompass all houses and buildings existing in the world. That is, objects belonging to the same class, phenomena that have the same features as indicated in the concept are called by the same word. The essence of the concept is different, the concept has a different nature, and the ideas related to it constitute the core of cognitive linguistics. The semantic and cognitive core of the concept is also formed by general and universal knowledge about objects. However, unlike the concept, in addition to those universal features, and perhaps more important than them, national-cultural features are also concentrated in the concept. Therefore, the difference between the concept and the concept is directly manifested in the presentation of national thinking. On the contrary, the difference between the concept and the concept is that it is limited to a system of universal logical features [4].

It is clear that the presentation of national thinking must take place in some real and non-mental space. Without this, no other means can be found that would inform about the content of national, and nationally mass, thinking and psychology. The entities that are in mass psychology, that inhabit consciousness, undoubtedly have a mental and virtual character. Their only presentation is possible in language. However, if we accept F. de Saussure's dichotomy of language and speech, we must admit that national thinking and mass psychology are presented not in language, but precisely in speech. There is a subtle point here that we must also dwell on. The point is that language itself, according to Saussure, is a completely mental and ideal being. Language itself, as a mental and ideal being, is presented in speech. That is, we can only observe what is or is not in language in speech. However, what is observed in speech exists in language. In terms of realization, it can be noted that the difference between language and speech is simply that everything in language is constant, and within what is observed in speech, both the constant phenomena of language and occasional phenomena that are not in language and occur accidentally in speech are observed [4]. Therefore, concepts, as mental entities, are presented in language. They are observed in speech as mental phenomena presented in language. Observation in speech is directly related to verbalization. The term verbalization is originally connected with the Latin verbum, that is, "word", and means the transfer of a mental phenomenon to the level of speech (language, speech) [3]. We cannot have ideas about the national-cultural concepts that exist in mass consciousness. However, we can observe the traces, images and schemes of those concepts in speech (language). It is by systematizing the signs presented in language that we can obtain knowledge about individual concepts and the spaces of concepts in general.

There is an opinion that the founder of modern epistemology is the French scientist J. Piaget. In our opinion, J. Piaget's epistemology was completely opposed to N. Chomsky's theory of language. At the same time, there is an opinion that it is N. Chomsky's theory of language that forms the basis of modern cognitive science. In any case, it was the initial stage of cognitivism. Both theories are known and have gained supporters in the world. However, the number of supporters of N. Chomsky's theory of innate abilities is gradually decreasing. Language, as an extremely complex phenomenon, has a socio-cultural character. An interesting fact is that the most important social phenomenon standing between the World and society is language. It is in language (as a semiotic system) that the information gained about the world is encoded, systematized and preserved. The individual, on the other hand, goes through the path that society has taken on the path of ontogenesis and acquires the knowledge gained throughout the history of human society within 10–20 years. According to a well-known idea, secondary education is a person's path to humanity. It turns out that the only means standing between the human-individual and this system of human knowledge is the semiotic system called natural language. Modern linguistics, however, tries to study the psychological-social and even biological motives of this signification. Thus, cognitive linguistics opposes structural linguistics, but, in our opinion, does not deny it. The thing is that when cognitive linguistics is declared the newest paradigm in the history of linguistics, this new paradigm is often considered the end of structural linguistics. In fact, all existing paradigms serve the general goal of linguistics.

Cognitive linguistics is actually based on cognitive psychology and, in our opinion, does not arise on the basis of linguistics at all. For this reason, it is not entirely correct to connect cognitive linguistics with the science of language from a paradigmatic point of view and consider it a legitimate stage of it. For example, it is not true to describe cognitive linguistics as the opposite of structural and formal trends, but this also has its own logic. Since structuralism is a purely formal trend, it did not take into account the human factor. At the same time, this cannot be considered a mistake of the structuralists. The thing is that they did this quite consciously and, on the

contrary, considered the failure to consider the human factor (cognition, meaning, mental uniqueness) to be an achievement of the Saussurean paradigm. In such a case, scientists who brought the human factor into linguistics naturally understood this as a reflection of structural (formal) theories. However, the history of the humanities in general shows that paradigmatic changes in the history of linguistics are not solely the achievement of the science of language. Such paradigmatic innovation came to linguistics from the outside – from psychology. It was within the framework of psychology that a new and original concept arose, called cognitivism, and later the fundamental ideas that arose on this basis were transferred to the science of language. Of course, this idea of ours should not be accepted categorically, only a complex analysis of linguistics and its neighboring scientific fields shows this. In any case, it seems to us that it is incorrect to directly connect cognitive linguistics with the history of linguistics and to perceive it as a regular development of comparative-historical and system-structural paradigms.

In general, according to psychologists, ontogenesis repeats phylogenesis, that is, each individual in his development repeats the development of humanity. If so, then the ability to speak has not always existed in human history, but is the product of a certain stage. Furthermore, the ability to speak is possible at a certain and rather complex stage of intellectual capacity. We often accept that language is a social phenomenon as a formal phenomenon. In fact, this idea is a false idea inherent in vulgar sociology and Marxism. As is known, Marxism directly connects language with the joint labor activity of people. In our opinion, this thesis is correct, but solving the issue in such a mechanical way is not true. Man himself, as a social phenomenon, consistently develops within the framework of society. This development is called socialization in modern psychology and sociology, that is, the individual becomes a social being as a result of socialization. If it is possible to use such an expression – he becomes socialized, adapts to the social environment. And this happens simultaneously with intellectual development. That is, socialization (socialization) cannot be separated from intellectual development. On the contrary, these two processes often occur as components of a single process.

At first glance, the ideas that form the basis of cognitivism seem ordinary and undoubted, but they existed in other ideas in the field of linguistics. As we know, Noam Chomsky, one of the most prominent linguists of the last century, had a completely different opinion. In his works "Language and Thought",

"Aspects of the Theory of Syntax" and others, language ability is presented as an innate ability. According to Chomsky, if children acquire language ability despite the broken and incorrect speech of those around them, then this ability is hereditary and does not depend on socialization. Because if it depended on socialization, the new generation would not be able to restore correct language structures. Thus, modern cognitive linguistics was deeply rooted not in linguistics, but in psychology. Cognitive psychology, in fact, originated from mentalism, which is the opposite of behaviorism. This turn in the history of psychology is well-known and there is no need to talk about it at length here. In short, it can be said that behaviorism, by absolutizing the stimulus-response model, turned a person into a kind of mechanism. According to this psychological trend, every human action (including speech) is a response to a certain stimulus. As researchers note, the founder of behaviorism, J. Watson, did not deny the factor of cognition (mind, consciousness), in his opinion, only psychology as an exact science can bypass this factor. That is, psychologists can do without taking cognition into account in their research. Thus, Watson excludes cognition from the methodology of behaviorism. That is why in the history of psychology this theory is remembered as methodological behaviorism. However, later the scientist began to deny cognition in general and put forward a new maximalist concept called radical behaviorism. Behaviorism was based on experiments on animals, and its main achievements were related to the disclosure of the mechanism of "learning". Interestingly, in the mechanism of "learning" the "force" that exists between the stimulus and the response and corrects the response was denied. In this case, "learning" itself had a mechanical character. That is, perception was denied as a process, because perception, as a cognitive process, was far from mechanical nature. For example, the "learning" of animals was beyond perception, and therefore these two processes cannot be identified. On the other hand, the denial of the phenomenon of perception itself could create the illusion that behaviorism was an exact science. In fact, the denial of perception, in our opinion, was a denial of human nature, because only the mechanism of reflection, that is, the existence of thought based on thought, makes a person both a social and intellectual being.

Mentalism, as its name suggests, was the opposite of behaviorism. The internal form of both terms indicates their essence. Behaviorism was associated with behavior (behavior – behavior, behavior), and mentalism directly connects scientific thought with cognition (mentality – cognition).

Interestingly, cognitivism also restores the basic model of behaviorism. That is, cognitivism retains the concepts of stimulus and response, but gives them a completely new explanation. Cognitivism perceives stimulus and response only at the signal level. Naturally, the stimulus is considered as an incoming signal, and the response is considered as an outgoing signal. The simplest view of this model shows that cognitivism introduces such an important factor as cognition into the molds of behaviorism. This completely changes the mechanism of "learning".

Thus, the term cognitivism itself is not used in the same sense in different studies. According to modern terminology, cognitive discourse allows us to talk about three directions. Or, in cognitive discourse, the term cognitivism is used in three senses. The first of these, as mentioned above, is mentalism, which is formed against behaviorism, and within the framework of cognitive discourse, the return to mentalism is defined as cognitivism, which is met from a terminological and conceptual point of view as an appeal to purely mental, cognitive processes. Here, we are usually talking about information production, mental calculation, obedience to certain rules, and similar processes. Thinking, memory activity (recall), recognition, decision-making, etc. mental processes or cognitive representation processes determines the nature and their characteristics. According to this direction, the environment is represented symbolically in the inner world of man.

Finally, the third meaning of the term cognitivism, which is found in cognitive discourse, opposes it (cognitivism) to connectivism, more precisely, here the stage in which cognitivism is replaced by connectivism is meant. Here, the main idea of cognitivism is that the external and internal worlds are represented in the mind of a thinking person. Thus, the ability of cognition to represent is taken as the basis here.

Thus, modern cognitive linguistics, as a new research direction, views language as a cognitive mechanism and cognitive tool that encodes and represents information. Natural language, as a semiotic system, is both an internal and external entity for man. That is, in terms of socialization and assimilation of cultural traditions, language is a tool that stands outside man. On the other hand, the mother tongue, as an ability, is transmitted from generation to generation at a hereditary level. In this sense, the mother tongue expression in the Azerbaijani language has extremely important information. This expression itself can be considered exemplary in the context of cognitive linguistics. That is, in the collective consciousness of the ethnos, some symbols representing knowledge about the world associate language with the mother. Interestingly, while it associates words and wisdom with the father, it associates the ability to speak, the ability to encode-decipher information and retain it for centuries with the mother. Therefore, this ability is associated with mother's milk, with primary food.

Cognitive linguistics studies the process of meaning, and in this regard, the mechanism of speech production is taken into account. Of course, this area shows the connection of cognitive linguistics with psycholinguistics, and in fact, psycholinguistics has also played a major role in the basis of modern cognitive linguistics. On the other hand, since the main subject of cognitive linguistics is the mechanism of consciousness and cognition to perceive the world, the signs and symbols of a specific language are considered in relation to the semantic coefficients inherent in a specific language. Cognitive linguistics analyzes natural language as a system consisting of independent dimensions that process information and thus come into play. Thus, in the human mind, linguistic information is combined at different levels. Of course, all that has been said connects cognitive linguistics with cognitive psychology, but the subjects of these two sciences are different. Cognitive linguistics studies human cognitive activity only at the level of the language-sign system and speech-speaking ability. In general, the formation of scientific paradigms takes a long time and it is difficult or even impossible to say any exact date. However, there is an opinion that the foundation of cognitive linguistics was laid in 1989. This year, the International Association of Cognitive Linguistics was created, which began publishing in this field.

Conclusion. Today, the formation of cognitive linguistics has not yet reached its logical conclusion. On the one hand, this indicates the weakness of any scientific paradigm. However, on the other hand, it indicates the breadth of the scope of research. Today, linguists all over the world are trying to conduct research that can meet the requirements of cognitivism. The uniqueness of national languages is studied primarily in connection with the unique way they process knowledge about the world. Of course, the importance of this direction is undeniable not only in comparison with structural linguistics, but also in itself. If the style of expression is associated with ethnic views, then natural languages are intellectual enterprises that process knowledge on the basis of original external information. Perhaps, cognitivism, like structuralism, is also aimed at identifying a single mechanism that is universal and therefore applicable

to all languages. If so, the difference between structuralism and cognitivism is only in the nature of that universal entity. Structural linguistics was looking for a universal structure that is independent of national languages, while cognitive linguistics is still trying to discover a universal knowledge-processing mechanism that is independent of national languages.

As the researchers note, cognitive analysis tries to cover all layers of language, but it is clear that when it comes to meaning, this primarily includes language units that express a whole and independent meaning. That is, language units that denote specific extralinguistic phenomena constitute the most important material of cognitive linguistics. Among them, undoubtedly, proverbs stand in the first place. The reason for this is obvious. Proverbs express judgments about the world and, therefore, knowledge. If this knowledge is universal, then knowledge also has a universal character. Otherwise, if there are differences in content in the formulas expressing knowledge, then cognitions also have national specificity.

Bibliography:
1. Abdullayev K. Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri. Bakı: Marif, 1999, 281 s.
2. Brugman C. and Lakoff G. Cognitive topology and lexical networks. In S. Small, G. Cottrell and M. Tannenhaus (eds), Lexical Ambiguity Resolution. San Mateo, CA : Morgan Kaufman, 1988, pp. 477–507.
3. Croft W., Cruse A. Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, 2004, 372 p.
4. Cuyckens H., Dirven R., Taylor J. Cognitive Approaches to Lexical Semantics. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 2003, 502 p.

Джафарова У. Н. СУЧАСНА ЛІНГВІСТИКА ТА ЇЇ ВИЗНАЧАЛЬНІ ПРИНЦИПИ

З когнітивною сутністю когнітивісти пов'язують граматику, тобто граматичну будову мови і навіть фонетичну систему. Правда, самі вони відзначають, що в звуках і граматичних моделях показати сліди сенсу світу вкрай складно. Але при цьому не заперечують можливості цього. Основними й фундаментальними постулатами когнітивної лінгвістики є. Коли це зроблено, стає зрозуміло, що мова в цілому визначає своєрідність свідомості людей у сприйнятті світу. Саме мова стоїть між свідомістю народу і світом і виконує роль свого роду посередника. Мова кодує і зберігає знання про світ. Сучасне мовознавство, яке має таке ставлення до мови і вбачає основну функцію мови в засвоєнні та кодуванні знань, висуває на перший план проблему гносеології. Епістемологія – термін, що походить від грецького кореня epistete і означає «наукове знання», «справжнє знання». Природно, що когнітивна лінгвістика має приділити особливу увагу проблемі епістемології, оскільки когнітивістика як загальнонауковий напрям висуває на перший план проблему когнітивних закономірностей. Основою напряму є ідея пізнання. Пізнання складається з трьох етапів, перший з яких – ознайомлення з інформацією, другий – виробництво інформації і, нарешті, третій – подання інформації. Всі три етапи і когнітивізм в цілому безпосередньо і тісно пов'язані з проблемою гносеології. Як відомо, основою епістемології є протиріччя між науковим знанням і звичайною думкою, англійською – science і opinion. Основне питання гносеології полягає в тому, чи є уявлення людей про життя і навколишнє середовище істинними чи хибними? Правдиве чи хибне наше знання про життя? У філософському плані різниця між емпіричним і раціональним знанням є фундаментальною чи ні.

Ключові слова: *лінгвістика, знання, інформація, структуралізм, когніція.*