

General Cognitive Characteristics of the Concept of Concession

M. A. Abduvaliyev, Umirzaqov Qodirjon Toxirjonovich, Ismoilov Abdurashid Isakovich,
Baxriddinov Muslimbek Muxiddinovich and Vositov Otabek Tohirjonovich
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages Andijan, Uzbekistan

Keywords: Cognitive, Concession, Nature, Society, Characteristics.

Abstract: The concept of accessibility is a multifaceted mental construct characterized by a complex structure that integrates cognitive, linguistic, abstract, concrete, national, and personal elements. Examining its structure and content provides valuable insights into understanding and systematizing the study of accessibility relations, particularly in how they manifest within the linguistic landscape across the world. This approach allows for a comprehensive exploration of accessibility, bridging various dimensions of human experience and expression.

1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of the concept of concession is a universal unit of thought that has taken its place in the conceptosphere of different peoples, it is an open mental structure that reflects knowledge about the internal and external world. The concept of barrier-freeness, like other concepts, has its own, unique, general and similar characteristics. However, it should be noted that the place of the concept of the concept of concession in the conceptosphere, its cognitive characteristic features, structure, content, verbal and nonverbal characteristics, etc., have not been the object of special research in the field of linguoculturology, in particular linguistic conceptology. An analysis of existing explanatory dictionaries has shown that the concept of the concept of concession has not found its full explanation and interpretation. For example: (WTNID) defines the concept of concession as follows. "The concept of concession is an act or mistake of delaying or refusing to comply with an expressed pressure, a verbal demand or request"

Published by S.I. Ozhegov and N.Yu. Shvedova, Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language In the explanatory dictionary (4th edition, supplemented in 2020) [27.3] "concession, i. f. 1. see to concede. 2. To give up something in favor of another. To make concessions. 3. figurative. A compromise solution, a relaxation in something. No concessions against one's convictions. 4. A discount from the appointed price (colloquial) To sell with a concession" If it has the

following meanings, its adjective form is: **concessive**, -ая, -ое. In grammar: expressing the discrepancy between something and the existing conditions" It is explained as. [Шведова, Ожегов 2020:808] in the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language [28.69]. The concept of barrier-free has not found its definition, in which the adjective form barrier-free is interpreted as follows: 1. An open road without barriers, an unobstructed courtyard. 2. without any resistance, without obstacles. Unobstructed work. An unobstructed subordinate clause. A subordinate clause with an expanded meaning that contradicts the content of the main clause, but can be an obstacle to it [28.27]. The concept of barrier-freeness, as a complex and multifaceted unity of thought, reflects the relationships that have occurred, may occur, or are unrealistic to occur in various spheres of objective existence, in particular, nature and society. The relationship of impermanence arises as a perception and perception of the relationship between animals (fauna), plants (flora), natural phenomena in nature, people in society (women and men, youth and adults in societies of different social views, etc.) or between nature and society (people and natural phenomena). Based on our observations, rigorous experiments and a logical approach to the issue, we can distinguish the following types of concessive relationships: person (s) < - > person (s), person (s) < - > natural phenomena, person (s) < - > animals (fauna), animals < - > plants, person (s) < - > the world of plants (flora), person (s) < - > the inner world of person (s) < - > the inner world of person (s), etc. Such

Table 1: Disturbing situation

Disturbing situation		Consensive result
Though women are angels,	←---→	yet wedlocks the devil[4.48].
Dead or alive. No matter how little you eat.	←---→	You put on teach if you're made[13.211]. It is still their late past[1.106].
It is still their past	←---→	you put on flash of you are made[13.211].
Even though Sultan Murad tried to distance himself	←---→	the wave of the people swept him away[9.440].
He says I bowed to man with my giant head; he says I bowed, he says I became a slave,	←---→	but he says he was not a man[15.131].
Even if you kill me	←---→	I don't see any way out.

Table 2: Insufficient status

Insufficient status		Consensive result
Even if you didn't care still	←---→	We never could be on conventional terms with one another again[13.178]
Though I tried very hard	←---→	I couldn't finish my work in time.
Even if I help	←---→	He couldn't finish the job.
Even if parents come	←---→	I won't enter. [2.144].
Even though I helped him	←---→	He was unable to finish the work.

relationships are two-part (component), and there is a relationship of contradiction between these parts.

We propose the following definition of the concept of barrierlessness, generalizing the views of a number of scholars in this field: The concept of barrierlessness is a set of knowledge in the consciousness of a society (s) about the result of a situation in which objects or phenomena in the external and internal world are in a mutually exclusive and contradictory (contrasting) relationship, as well as positive, negative, neutral and subjective assessments given to it.

Thus, the concept of barrierlessness essentially consists of two mutually exclusive and opposing, mutually negating parts. If its first element is a barrier, then the second constituent component (or element) consists of a state without obstacles.

2 DISCUSSIONS

The first part of the concept consists of the basic characteristics of the action, state, process, etc., and we distinguish two types of it, namely the disruptive state (displacing circumstance) and deficiency (missing circumstance).

The logical structure of the components of the concept of accessibility also has the forms of a concessionary state - a disruptive state or a deficient state:

Table 3: Consensive result.

Disturbing situation		Consensive result
No matter what comes [2.386]	←---→	Day to days Yords was must go on from
even though he was suffering from splitting headache [2.386].	←---→	He smiled,
Do whatever you want.	←---→	I will not obey you,
even though the girl is seriously ill.	←---→	The girl's hope did not fade,

Table 4: Unobstructed state.

Obstacle	←-----→	Unobstructed (state) result
action	←-----→	action
state	←-----→	situation
situation	←-----→	situation
condition	←-----→	conditions

Logically, the element "obstacle" that constitutes the concept of the concept of concession can come before or after "unobstructed state", from this point of view, it can have two schematic (positional) forms. If the obstacle element of the concept embodies the obstacle action, state, situation, condition, etc., then the element "unobstructed state" also consists of the above-mentioned elements.

Oppositional relations arise on the basis of action - action - action - state; situation - state, condition - condition, etc., and they enter into mutual affirmation - denial, denial - affirmation, denial - denial, affirmation - affirmation, (but with contradictory semantics). The analysis made it possible to determine the composition of universal cognitive signs of the concept of impermanence. These are:

1. The concept of impermanence arises on the basis of the opposition of two-component impermanence relations.

2. The concept of impermanence is based on the universal cognitive model "State - Concessional Result".

3. The first component of the impermanence concept consists of interfering or deficient states.

4. Among the components of the impermanence concept, there are affirmation - denial, denial -

affirmation, sometimes denial - denial, affirmation - affirmation, relations.

5. The contradictory relationships between the components of the concept of barrierlessness arise as a reflection of the relations of actions, states, situations, and conditions that are observed and real between objects and phenomena in the internal and external world.

6. The concept of barrierlessness forms a reserve of ready-made cognitive knowledge in the human mind, which is verbalized in language and speech in an explicit and implicit way due to the need for communication.

7. The concept of barrierlessness is pure in content or takes on a linguistic appearance as an additional element of the semantics of other types of concepts (time + barrierlessness, place + barrierlessness, measure - degree + barrierlessness, subjectivity + barrierlessness, attribute + barrierlessness), etc.

The concept of barrierlessness finds its own linguistic appearance in each language. By studying the semantics of language and speech units, by describing the conceptsphere of a particular people, it is possible to discover which cognitive signs of the history of a particular people have gained importance, which have been neglected, their place, nominative density, national, social, collective and individual

characteristics of the concept. From this point of view, there is a need to study the units that make up the field of impermanence.

According to the examples given above, the description of impermanence relations is based on the logical connection of parts of a sentence, that is, the logical relations of inverse cause or inverse condition and result. Such an approach is used, for example, in Russian linguistics by N.I.Greg [8.30], F.I.Buslaeva [18.2], V.A. It is also observed in the studies of Bogoroditsky [17.3], B.V.Lavrov [3.25], N.S.Pospelov [26.4], A.N.Gvozdev [7.85], N.A.Zhdanov [22.33], L.S.Estrina [30.16], etc. Otto Erdman et al. [6.5]: recognizing the close relationship between the relations of non-obstruction and contradiction, support the idea that the basis of non-obstruction relations (hereinafter -TM) is contradiction, opposition. Also, B.V.Lavrov, O.Erdman write about the connection of TM with separation relations [16.14], A.V.Poutsma [10.6], O.Erdman[5.5] about the connection of TM with limiting relations [5.5]. It is worth noting that a common view regarding the definition of TMs is to contrast TMs with causal relationships.

Among the linguists who consider TMs as a special type of conditional relations are V.A. Bogoroditsky, B.V. Lavrov, A.F. Mikheev, G. Wendt, G. Paul [23.10] and others. The definitions of N.S. Pospelov, A.V. Bogomolova and A.F. Mikheev are based on the principle of indicating inverse conditionality. A.A. Vasil'eva [19.27] understands the inverse conditional relation as the fact that the presence of the thing mentioned in the subordinate clause calls for the thing mentioned in the main clause and, conversely, makes the thing mentioned in the subordinate clause impossible. [Васильева, 1965:4]. Based on the existence of various types of non-obstructive constructions, the scientist expresses the opinion that the meaning of non-obstructiveness is mixed with the relations of cause, effect, condition, contradiction and separation. T.G. According to Pechenkina [25.6], all non-impedimental sentences are based on a contradiction, an implicit and explicit (opposite) contradiction between two outcomes. In other words, there are direct and reverse semantic connections between them, which arise based on the contradiction relationship. The contradiction relationship connecting these two outcomes is formed through special means of communication and creates TMs. The scientist notes that an important semantic component of non-impedimental sentences is a component with the semantics of the reverse result, which is in a contradictory relationship with the

correct result. Therefore, non-impedimental sentences are called inversely conditioned sentences.

This relationship is understood as an external condition, that is, a condition (*obstoyatel'stvo*) that prevents the implementation of an action, and he believes that the action will still be implemented regardless of the fact it expresses.

R.M. Grechishnikova [25.7], in the modern Russian language, writes: In the semantics of interdependence, interdependence relations between phenomena in objective existence, which are generally reflected in our consciousness, are internally connected. Interdependence relations arise on the basis of the interaction of two cause-effect relations. We represent the elements of such relations by the symbols $\Pi 1$ (the first cause), $\Pi 2$ (its result), $\Pi 2$ (the second cause), and $\Pi 2$ (the result of this cause) and imagine their logical structure in the form of implications $\Pi 1 \rightarrow C 1$ and $\Pi 2 \rightarrow C 2$ [25.7]. According to the scientist, as a result of the collision of two causes, one of them ($\Pi 2$) acquires a higher level and a violation of the primary cause-effect relation is observed. In this case, the action of the first cause ($\Pi 1$) becomes insufficient for the realization of its result. Due to the fact that the first cause ($P 1$) has disappeared and has not disappeared, and the second cause ($P 2$) causes its result ($C 2$), the first cause and the result of the second cause, that is, (elements $P 1$ and $C 2$), enter into a certain relationship with each other. $P 1-C 2$ prevents the implementation of the result, but it cannot sufficiently prevent the implementation of the result $C 2$. Therefore, the result $C 2$ is implemented despite the fact that the same cause prevents its implementation. In the course of such simple orderly cause-effect relationships, relatively complex relations of non-obstruction arise. There is a contradiction of affirmation and negation between the expected result and the actually realized result. Based on this, R.M. Grechishnikova [20.9] distinguishes two types of TMs, namely 1) relations of the result with insufficient grounds and the opposite to it; 2) relations that are against the grounds.

The scientist explains these two types of TMs as follows: "TMs of the first category are those in which the content of the pure unobstructed part is not sufficient to provide a sufficient basis for the realization of the result that is opposite to the content of the second part, and also in which the unobstructed action in the second part is not sufficient to provide a sufficient basis for the realization of the result that is expected based on the content of the unobstructed part." The essence of the relationship of opposing grounds is that the content of the first part is not sufficient to provide a sufficient basis for the

realization of the expected result, and the content of the second part expresses the motivation for the non-realization of this result, that is, the opposite basis for the realization of the expected result [20.8]. N.P. Perfil'eva [24.6], studying the Russian language, believes that the common feature of such constructions is the assessment of a certain event as an insufficient reason for the occurrence of another event or as a negative result.

Poutsma [11.25] calls aversion an arsetive adversative relation, and he says that it has this property when one member expresses the opposite of the conclusion expected from another member.

R. Kverk[12.391] writes that it is appropriate to give the following definition as a working definition: "...We can say that the relationship of aversion exists between two parts of a sentence. In this case, one part is a surprise for the other part". The English linguist H. Sweet [14.211] writes that "adverse adverbs are manifestations of conditional adverbs".

3 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the concept of accessibility is a multidimensional mental construct with a complex structure that combines cognitive and linguistic, abstract and concrete, national and personal characteristics. Studying its structure and content makes it possible to understand and systematize the study of the expression of accessibility relations in the linguistic landscape of the world.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams. (1971). The path of thunder (p. 106).
 Asqad, M. (1973). Tanlangan asarlar, 3 tom (p. 144).
 Byron. (1966). The works of Byron (p. 46).
 Erdmann, O. (1876). Investigations into the Syntax of Otfrid's Language. Part Two. The Formations of the Noun. Halle: Publishers of the Orphanage Bookstore.
 Gvozdev, A. N. (1952). Essays on the stylistics of the Russian language uText. Moscow: Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR.
 Ipsen, G. (1924). The Ancient Orient and the Indo-Europeans. Festschrift for W. Streitberg. Heidelberg, 30-45.
 Lavrov, B. V. (1963). Conditional and concessive sentences in Old Russian. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
 Lavrov, B. V. (1963). Conditional and concessive sentences in Old Russian. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
 Oybek. (1985). Navoiy. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
 Poutsma, X. (1905). A grammar of late modern English for the use of continental especially Dutch students, Section: Composite sentence. Noordhoff-Groningen.
 Quirk, A. (1982). A university grammar of English. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola.
 Show. (1972). Collected plays with their prefaces (p. 211).
 Svit, X. (1971). Unconditional clauses are forms of conditional clauses. (p. 225).
 Tog'ay, M. (2009). The stars burn forever. (p. 131).
 Buslaeva, F. I. (1881). Historical grammar of the Russian language. (5th ed.). Moscow: Tip. T. Ris.
 Vasilyeva, A. A. (1965). Syntactic methods of expressing concessiveness in German (AKD) (p. 27). Leningrad.
 Grechishnikova, R. M. (1971). Complex sentences with phraseological means of expressing concessive relations in modern Russian (Kand. diss.).Leningrad.
 N.A. Zhdanov. (2014). English Grammar (p. 510). Moscow: Kniga po Trebovaniyu.
 Paul, G. (1960). Principles of the History of Language. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoy literatury.
 Perfilieva, O. (2020). SYNCRETISM OF INTRODUCTORY UNITS WITH THE SEMANTICS OF "I THINK". Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University.
 Pechenkina, T. G. (1976). The syntactic category of concessiveness and forms of its expression in the Russian literary language of the second half of the 19th century (Author's Abstract of Dissertation). Leningrad.
 Pospelov, N. S. (1997). Thoughts on Russian grammar: Selected works. Moscow: Librokon.
 S.I. Ozhegov, & N.Yu. Shvedova. (1992). Only dictionary of the Russian language. Moscow.
 From the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language. (2020). Toshkent.
 Estrina, L. S. (1970). Concessive constructions formed by pronominal words with the part ni in the modern Russian literary language (AKD). Kazan.