THE PROBLEM OF MODELING COGNITIVE SYNONYMS IN LINGUISTICS

Sayidiraximova Nasiba Sayidmakhamadovna

Associate Professor of the Department of Uzbek and Foreign Languages,

International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan,

Candidate of Philological Sciences

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

sayidiraximova@gmail.com

Abstract

The article analyzes the problem of modeling synonymous units based on a cognitive approach in linguistics. Relying on the main principles of cognitive linguistics, it explores the conceptual, semantic, and psycholinguistic characteristics of synonyms. The semantic proximity between synonyms is explained through conceptual structures formed in human cognition, as well as by means of prototypes and frames. Using examples from the Uzbek language, the study identifies cognitive reasons for semantic differences among certain synonymous sets. The results demonstrate that cognitive modeling methods are effective in analyzing linguistic units.

Keywords

cognitive linguistics, synonymy, cognitive model, conceptual analysis, frame, prototype, semantic network, metaphor.

Introduction

Cognitive linguistics is a field that studies the manifestation of human thought through language. It analyzes meaning, thinking, and the perception of the world by means of linguistic units. From this point of view, the issue of cognitive synonymy examines linguistic units that differ in form but are based on similar conceptual structures in human cognition.

Synonyms exist not only at the lexical level, but also at syntactic and cognitive levels. Within the cognitive approach, synonymy is understood as an identical conceptual model expressed through different linguistic constructions.

Main Part

The study of cognitive synonyms is closely related to the formation of the cognitive paradigm in linguistics. This direction began to take shape in the second half of the 20th century, particularly with G. Lakoff and M. Johnson's influential

work "Metaphors We Live By" (1:256). They connected language with the conceptual structures of human thought, explaining words and expressions through metaphorical models of cognition.

The cognitive nature of synonymic units can also be analyzed within the framework of this conceptual metaphor theory: various forms of synonyms, in fact, express the same conceptual basis (for example, the concepts of knowing, perceiving, or feeling) through different metaphorical realizations.

In R.Langacker's "Foundations of Cognitive Grammar" (2), the theory of cognitive grammar is elaborated. According to it, all linguistic units including synonyms represent the verbal manifestation of human mental imagery, experience, and cognitive models.

Thus, synonymy is not merely a phenomenon of semantic similarity between words, but rather a reflection of semantic interconnectedness among various cognitive models that underlie linguistic meaning.

In Ch.Fillmore's Frame Semantics (3) theory, each word or phrase is associated with a certain frame, that is, a conceptual situation based on human experience. Therefore, synonyms are located within the same frame but may be realized from different focuses or cognitive perspectives.

For example, the Uzbek verbs "o'ylamoq" ("to think"), "mushohada yuritmoq" ("to reflect"), and "tafakkur qilmoq" ("to contemplate") all belong to the same thinking process frame, yet each highlights a distinct aspect: "o'ylamoq" emphasizes the inner cognitive process, "mushohada yuritmoq" the analytical or logical reasoning, and "tafakkur qilmoq" the deep philosophical contemplation.

Another important direction of the cognitive approach is E.Rosch's Prototype Theory (4). This theory allows identifying the position of synonymous units in the cognitive system and their "center–periphery" relationship.For instance, the verb "o'ylamoq" is considered a prototypical (central) member of the conceptual field of thinking, as it conveys the most general and basic meaning of cognition. Meanwhile, "mulohaza yuritmoq" ("to reason"), "fikr qilmoq" ("to make a thought"), and "tafakkur qilmoq" ("to philosophize") are peripheral members of the same category, expressing more specific or stylistically marked nuances of the same prototype.

A.Wierzbicka (5), through her theory of semantic universals, studies synonyms by identifying the universal meaning invariants underlying them. This approach provides a theoretical foundation for cognitive modeling, since every synonym is ultimately based on universal human concepts such as knowing, feeling, wanting, saying, and others. For example, the Uzbek verbs "xohlash" ("to want"), "istash" ("to desire"), and "orzu qilmoq" ("to dream of") all stem from the

same conceptual base of desire, yet they differ in the degree of emotional intensity and cognitive nuance.

Within Russian cognitive linguistics, scholars such as E.S.Kubryakova (7), N.N.Boldyrev (8), Z.D.Popova, and I.A.Sternin (9) have deeply explored the cognitive essence of language.

E.S. Kubryakova, in her work "Language and Knowledge", interprets language both as a means and a result of cognition. According to her, the existence of synonymic units is connected with the necessity to conceptualize one and the same concept from different cognitive perspectives. For instance, the concept of knowing in Uzbek can be represented by "bilmoq" ("to know"), "anglamoq" ("to comprehend"), and "sezmoq" ("to sense"), each highlighting distinct cognitive processes analytical cognition, intuitive understanding, and emotional perception, respectively.

Y.D. Apresyan, in "Lexical Semantics" (6), analyzes synonyms through semantic invariants and develops a methodology for identifying fine semantic distinctions within cognitive processes. His approach serves as the linguistic foundation of cognitive modeling, demonstrating how meaning differentiation reflects the structure of human conceptualization.

In Uzbek linguistics, a cognitive approach to studying linguistic phenomena began to take shape in the early 2000s. In particular, Sh.Safarov's monograph "Cognitive Linguistics" (11) laid the scientific foundations for this field. However, research in this area is still relatively limited. This is primarily due to the fact that many issues such as cognitive syntax, the linguocognitive features of syntactic synonyms, and the cognitive models underlying their formation remain among the most pressing and unresolved problems in contemporary Uzbek linguistics.

It is well known that representing a situation in language is a complex process. Such cognitive models are formed based on the internal capacities of each language and are common to its speakers. However, the use of these models and their lexical-grammatical realization is optional for each language user.

For example, the syntactic synonyms "Men ishladim" (I worked), "Kamina ishladi" (Your humble servant worked), and "O'zim ishladim" (I myself worked) are formed within the [SUBJECT + PHYSICAL ACTION] model, and they convey information about the subject's work activity.

All three sentences reflect the same situation that is, a person's act of working therefore, they share a common semantic meaning. However, their syntactic structures differ. From this, it can be concluded that cognitive models based on human knowledge underlie syntactic synonymy.

Therefore, syntactic synonyms should be analyzed not only as grammatical phenomena but also from a cognitive perspective, since they reveal how the speaker perceives reality, evaluates it, and organizes it within conceptual domains. This situation proves the necessity of studying syntactic synonyms from a cognitive aspect.

In the formation of syntactic synonyms, cognitive models act as the main instrument. In Uzbek, there are several cognitive models that underlie the creation of syntactic synonyms. These models are primarily formed on conceptual bases such as human activity, quantitativeness, cause-effect relationships, and a person's social and psychological state. Each model reflects a person's knowledge about the world, their culture, and linguistic experience. The syntactic synonyms observed in Uzbek can be grouped according to the following cognitive models:

We will analyze the syntactic synonyms formed on the basis of the following characteristic cognitive models in the Uzbek language:

1.   [Quantity + Action + Result] cognitive model.
2.   [Subject's Action + Result of Action] cognitive model.
3.   [Subject + Object + Result of Action] cognitive model.
4.   [Person + Action + Result of Action] cognitive model.
5.   [Person + Their Psychological State] cognitive model.
6.   [Person + Their Social State] cognitive model.

Below, these conceptual domains are analyzed through examples of syntactic synonyms in the Uzbek language.

1. [Quantity + Action + Result] cognitive model. The semantic field of this model is formed by features such as quantity, action intensity, and resultivity. For example, "Bir marta telefon qildi" – "Bir bor telefon orqali bog'landi" ("He called once" – "He got in touch by phone once") all these sentences are considered syntactic synonym constructions as they express concepts belonging to the above domain. Sentences formed on the basis of this model place the action performed by the subject into the cognitive structure from the perspective of quantity. Here, the concept of quantity either broadens or limits the scope of the action. Human cognition tends to evaluate the value and significance of an action by increasing or decreasing its extent.

Therefore, through syntactic synonyms formed on the basis of the [Quantity + Action + Result] cognitive model, human thinking encodes a certain reality according to the "singularity–plurality" scale.

Sometimes, in the [Quantity + Action + Result of Action] conceptual model of human cognition, the word many, which expresses quantity within the semantic

field of quantitative Ness, serves as the main means of indicating the frequency of an action (e.g., the number or frequency of reading books). For example,

In the formation of the sentences "Ko'p o'qisa, yaxshi biladi" ("If one reads a lot, one knows well") and "Ko'p o'qigan yaxshi biladi" ("One who has read a lot knows well"), the action o'qish (reading) represents the process of gaining knowledge, while the result: yaxshi bilish (knowing well) reflects a high level of knowledge. These conceptual elements are activated and serve as the basis for the formation of syntactic synonyms.

In such a situation, both sentences convey the same semantic core — the idea that "as a result of reading many books, one's knowledge increases" ("kitobni ko'p o'qish natijasida bilim ortadi").

Thus, these syntactic synonyms are constructed on the basis of the model "Ko'p (miqdor) → o'qimoq (harakat) → yaxshi bilmoq (natija)" ("Much (quantity) → to read (action) → to know well (result)"). The reason is that in the cognitive process, when a person forms knowledge according to the "action–outcome" model, it is perceived that the more effort is put into reading, the greater the knowledge and results achieved. In the sentence "Ko'p o'qisa, yaxshi biladi" ("If one reads a lot, one knows well"), a conditional relationship (if → result) is expressed. In this construction, the process of acquiring knowledge is presented on the basis of conditionality:

"Agar ko'p o'qish harakati bajarilsa, u holda yaxshi bilish jarayoni amalga oshadi" ("If the act of reading a lot is performed, then the process of knowing well takes place"). From this, the conceptual map of these sentences can be defined in terms of condition and cause-effect relations. In such a case, the sentence carries a pragmatic meaning of a general rule or a proverb-like wisdom.

The sentence "Ko'p o'qigan yaxshi biladi" ("One who has read a lot knows well"), however, does not refer to a general rule, but rather points to a specific person or an experienced situation. Here, the result of the action (bilish – knowing) is presented as an accomplished state, and the conceptual map of the sentence consists in proving a factual result. The sentence thus carries a pragmatic meaning based on a person's individual experience. The cognitive difference between the two lies in the following:

In the first sentence, "Ko'p o'qisa, yaxshi biladi" ("If one reads a lot, one knows well"), human cognition conceptualizes the process of gaining knowledge as a general law or universal principle. In the second sentence, "Ko'p o'qigan yaxshi biladi" ("One who has read a lot knows well"), the increase of knowledge is presented as a reliable fact, grounded in personal experience.

Thus, both sentences are formed on the basis of the same cognitive model [Quantity + Action + Result], yet their functions in the semantic field and conceptual interpretations differ: one expresses a conditional general law, while the other denotes a state with a proven result.

In summary, these sentences, "Ko'p o'qisa, yaxshi biladi" ("If one reads a lot, one knows well") are compound sentences formed by the conditional mood suffix (-sa), whereas "Ko'p o'qigan yaxshi biladi" ("One who has read a lot knows well") is a simple sentence formed on the basis of the verb form (-gan). Although their grammatical structures differ, their semantic outcome is the same. Their synonymic features are manifested in the following aspects: both express the connection between action and result (reading → knowing well); both reflect the cause–effect relationship in the cognitive process; both convey the idea that knowledge increases through repeated or extensive reading. The first sentence is based on the [Condition → Result] model.

"Ko'p o'qisa, yaxshi biladi" ("If one reads a lot, one knows well"). The second sentence, meanwhile, follows the [Quantity + Action + Result] model. "Ko'p o'qigan yaxshi biladi" ("One who has read a lot knows well"). However, in both sentences, the common concept – "the necessity of reading a lot in order to gain knowledge" ("bilim olish uchun ko'p o'qish zarurligi") is preserved. Thus, "Ko'p o'qisa, yaxshi biladi" ("If one reads a lot, one knows well") and "Ko'p o'qigan yaxshi biladi" ("One who has read a lot knows well") reflect the same reality, though they have different syntactic structures and, depending on the context, can be used interchangeably. Therefore, they are regarded as syntactic synonyms.

The sentences "Ko'p mehnat qilgan, yuksak natijaga erishadi" ("One who has worked hard achieves great results") and "Ko'p mehnat qilsang, yuksak natijaga erishasan" ("If you work hard, you will achieve great results") are both formed on the basis of the [Quantity + Action + Result of Action] model. That is, they are constructed according to the cognitive pattern [Miqdor (ko'p) + Harakat (mehnat qil) + Natija (yuksak natijaga erish)] ([Quantity (much) + Action (to work) + Result (to achieve a high result)]). In this conceptual field model, the main cognitive principle lies in the understanding that the greater the quantity, the higher the result ("miqdor ko'p bo'lsa → natija yuqori bo'ladi"). The reason is that in human experience there exists a universal connection between the amount of effort and the level of outcome. For example:

"Ko'p mehnat qilgan dehqon, ko'p hosil oladi" ("A farmer who has worked hard gets a rich harvest"). This experiential knowledge becomes consolidated in language through repeated linguistic expressions. Such cognitive knowledge is expressed in language through various syntactic models, that is:

1.Based on a consistent judgment (attributive form): "Ko'p mehnat qilgan, yuksak natijaga erishadi" ("One who has worked hard achieves great results") here, within the phrase "mehnat qilgan" ("has worked"), a conditional meaning is implicitly expressed, while the result is presented as a general statement or judgment.

2.Based on a conditional connection (if → result form): "Ko'p mehnat qilsang, yuksak natijaga erishasan" ("If you work hard, you will achieve great results") here, the conditional relationship is explicitly expressed, and the result is shown as being directly dependent on the condition.

In both sentences, the same cognitive basis (the greater the effort → the higher the result) is expressed. The difference lies only in their syntactic structure: one represents an unconditional judgment (consistent statement), while the other reflects a conditional relation. In terms of meaning, they are parallel constructions that are general in content and complementary to each other. Thus, "Ko'p mehnat qilgan, yuksak natijaga erishadi" ("One who has worked hard achieves great results") and "Ko'p mehnat qilsang, yuksak natijaga erishasan" ("If you work hard, you will achieve great results") are considered syntactic synonyms formed on the basis of the [Quantity + Action + Result of Action] cognitive model.

2. [Subject's action + Result of action] conceptual field model. In human experience, the idea that through labor one attains material or spiritual satisfaction has been formed as a universal piece of knowledge.

That is, "mehnat qilish" ("to work") → "moddiy ne'mat, ma'naviy qoniqish, jamiyatda obro' topish" ("material wealth, spiritual satisfaction, and social respect"). This knowledge originates from the universal life experience expressed in the saying "mehnat – rohat manbayi" ("labor is the source of happiness"). This cognitive model consists of conceptual domains such as "the process of a person's labor and the peace achieved after enduring effort", as well as "the accumulation of knowledge, skill, and experience gained through work" in human consciousness. In particular, this conceptual field is expressed in the language in two different syntactic forms. For example: "Kim mehnat qilsa, rohat ko'radi" ("Whoever works will find joy") and

"Mehnat qilgan rohat ko'radi" ("One who has worked enjoys rest/comfort"). In these syntactic synonyms, the same knowledge is expressed through different syntactic constructions: a conditional clause construction: "Kim mehnat qilsa, rohat ko'radi" ("Whoever works will find joy"), and a consistent judgment (attributive form) simple sentence: "Mehnat qilgan rohat ko'radi" ("One who has worked enjoys rest/comfort") both express the same conceptual relation. It can be seen that their syntactic forms differ: the first sentence, with the suffix –sa in "kim …sa",

explicitly expresses a condition–result relationship, while the second, through the form –gan, conveys the conditional meaning implicitly. However, both confirm the "labor → reward" cognitive model formed in human knowledge and experience. The conceptual field of these sentences is based on [Subject's Action + Result of Action], that is, Subject's action (mehnat qil – to work) + Result (rohat ko'rish – to enjoy comfort/pleasure). In their formation, the knowledge represented by "mehnat → rohat" ("labor leads to comfort/reward") serves as the main cognitive source domain. Thus, the sentences share a common conceptual source and are both syntactic synonyms derived from the same cognitive basis.

3. [Subject + Existence + Result of Action] cognitive model. It is known that when a person has strength and enthusiasm, they do not feel tired. This knowledge is formed from psychological and socio-life experience. In particular, the syntactic synonyms "Kimda g'ayrat bo'lsa, u charchamaydi" ("Whoever has enthusiasm will not get tired") and "G'ayrati bor odam charchamaydi" ("A person who has enthusiasm does not get tired") are formed on the basis of the [Subject + Existence + Result of Action] cognitive model. In these constructions, the leading cognitive concepts are: Subject (inson kimda / odam) (person / who / human being) + Existence (g'ayrat /enthusiasm, inner energy, spiritual-mental resource) + Result of Action – charchamaslik (not getting tired, continuing activity without interruption). Thus, this cognitive model is based on human experience: "qaysi shaxsda kuch-g'ayrat bo'lsa, u charchoqni yengib, uzoq vaqt ishlaydi" ("the person who has strength and enthusiasm overcomes fatigue and works for a long time"). Here, human life observations and experiences – such as "g'ayratli odamlar charchoqni yengadi" ("energetic people overcome fatigue") and "ruhiy kuch jismoniy holatga ham ta'sir qiladi" ("spiritual strength also affects physical condition") form the source domain of this model. This knowledge is preserved in the mind as part of human mental experience, and it finds expression in language through different syntactic models: a) conditional relational structure –

"Kimda g'ayrat bo'lsa, u charchamaydi" ("Whoever has enthusiasm will not get tired"): here, the presence of enthusiasm is presented as a condition for the result; b) consistent (attributive) structure – "G'ayrati bor odam charchamaydi" ("A person who has enthusiasm does not get tired"): in this case, enthusiasm is given as an inherent quality of the subject, and the result is expressed in a consistent, declarative manner. Both sentences are based on the same cognitive foundation: the proposition that the presence of enthusiasm in the subject → results in not getting tired (subyektda g'ayrat mavjud bo'lishi → charchamaslik natijasi). Therefore, they differ in syntactic structure: one is a conditional construction (kimda… bo'lsa / whoever has…), while the other is an attributive structure (g'ayrati bor odam / a

person who has enthusiasm). However, both express the same general meaning through different syntactic forms, thus they are syntactic synonyms. It becomes clear that syntactic synonymy arises on the basis of human cognition and knowledge models. Hence, in the above sentences, a person's psychological experience (g'ayrat → charchamaslik / enthusiasm → not getting tired) is embodied in the mind as a cognitive model. In language, this knowledge is realized through various syntactic variants, giving rise to syntactic synonyms based on cognitive foundations.

4. [Subject + Object + Result of Action] conceptual field. Every syntactic structure in language is based on certain knowledge scenarios (conceptual schemas) existing in the human mind. The [Subject + Object + Result of Action] model represents one of the fundamental cognitive structures of human thinking, where: Subject – is the initiator of the action, the agent; Object – is the entity affected by the action; Result of Action – is the ultimate goal or the final point of the action or process, forming the endpoint of the cognitive scenario. This model belongs to the conceptual field of "activity and result", in which the subject's action is closely connected with its outcome and manifests as an integrated cognitive structure. For example, the sentences "Farhod uy qurdi" (Farhod built a house), "Farhod uyni barpo etdi" (Farhod constructed the house), and "Farhod uy tikladi" (Farhod restored the house) though expressed through different syntactic structures share the same conceptual field: the concept of "creation/restoration of a house" (uyning yaratilishi/tiklanishi). From a cognitive perspective, the subject (Farhod) creates a change in reality through an action. This change is manifested in the object (the house), and the result is recorded in the mind as the realization of the subject's intention. From a semantic perspective, these synonymous sentences convey different expressive and stylistic nuances, yet their semantic core remains the same the sememe of "building/creating" (bunyod qilish/tiklash). However, from a conceptual standpoint, in human cognition this model becomes a cognitive universal based on the "agent – object – result" (agents – obyekt – natija) scenario. Within the framework of human knowledge, this model harmonizes with universal cognitive categories such as success, labor, creation, and purpose (omad, mehnat, yaratish, maqsad). From a cultural–mental viewpoint, the act of building a house (uy qurish) is closely associated with the concepts of stability, family, and social status (barqarorlik, oila, jamiyatdagi mavqe). In language, this model is realized through various syntactic variants (synonyms) that reflect the same cognitive structure in different linguistic forms.

In conclusion, the [Subject + Object + Result of Action] cognitive model represents the activity–result scenario in human thinking. Its main function is to

depict change in reality as a resultative process from the subject's point of view. Syntactic synonyms create different variants of this model, thereby manifesting cognitive universality in language. In the sentences, the structure

Subject – Farhod (the person performing the action) + Object – uy / house (the entity affected by the action) + Result of Action – uyning qurilishi / the building of the house (the resultative state) forms a cognitive model based on the knowledge that the subject's action → causes change in the object → producing a result (subyektning harakat qilishi → obyektda o'zgarish yuz berishi → natija hosil bo'lishi). In human experience, the concept of "building a house" (uy qurish) activates the conceptual domains of hard work, gradual process, and purposeful activity (og'ir mehnat, bosqichma-bosqich amalga oshiriladigan harakat, maqsadli faoliyat). Similarly, although the words "qurdi" (built), "barpo etdi" (constructed), and "tikladi" (restored) are used in different stylistic and lexical variants, they all rely on the same experiential knowledge the idea of bringing a house into existence, where the final result is a completed house. Thus, a single cognitive foundation is realized through various syntactic variants, for example: Farhod uy qurdi – Farhod built a house a simple declarative sentence, neutral in style. In more formal or literary styles, syntactic synonyms such as "Farhod uyni barpo etdi" (Farhod constructed the house) or "Farhod uy tikladi" (Farhod restored the house) are used. In all these constructions, there exists the sememe of the object being rebuilt or created with effort (obyektning qayta tiklanishi yoki qiyinchilik bilan barpo qilinishi semasi). In the formation of all three sentences, the same cognitive model operates:

the subject's action (Farhod) → change in the object (house) → result (the creation or restoration of the house). The difference among them lies only in lexical and stylistic choice: through the variants "qurdi" (built), "barpo etdi" (constructed), and "tikladi" (restored), one cognitive knowledge is expressed in different linguistic forms, producing syntactic synonyms. Thus, syntactic synonymy emerges as a result of the expression of cognitive models of human knowledge through various linguistic means. In this model, the formation of syntactic synonyms relies on universal knowledge established in human experience namely, the subject's action and the resulting change in the object. Language, in turn, translates this knowledge into different "linguistic forms", thereby generating syntactic synonyms that reflect the same cognitive foundation in diverse structural expressions.

5. [Person + Action + Result of Action] conceptual field. This cognitive model helps to express a person's general knowledge about activity and its outcome through syntactic synonyms. The model reflects a scenario in human cognition concerning the process of activity and its completion. Here: Person (Subject) – the

initiator of the action ("Men" / "I"); Action – the process of activity ("ishni bajarmoq / bitirmoq / tugatmoq" — to do / complete / finish the work); Result of Action – the final stage of the process ("ishning tugallanishi" / completion of the work) together form the cognitive basis of the construction. For example, the sentences "Men ishni bajardim" (I did the work) – "Men ishni bitirdim" (I completed the work) – "Men ishni tugatdim" (I finished the work) are syntactic synonyms that fully correspond to the [Person + Action + Result of Action] cognitive model. In this case, the "activity → process → result" scenario is activated in human cognition. Here, the Person (Subject) is "Men" (I) – the initiator of the action;

the Action is "bajardim / bitirdim / tugatdim" (did / completed / finished) different types of activity;

and the Result is the completion of the work ("ishning tugallanishi"). All these sentences express one general meaning "the person has finished the work" (shaxsning ishni oxiriga yetkazganligi).

However, through cognitive choice (bajar- / bitir- / tugat-), different facets of meaning are activated, reflecting human experiential knowledge of "the process of labor" and "activity", which together form a conceptual field. Cognitive knowledge related to "the end of work" or "the vivid realization of the result" constitutes the goal domain of the subject (subyektning maqsad maydoni). Thus, in human cognition, the idea that the work process leads to a result through activity is expressed in various ways through language (lison). As a result, in human knowledge, every action is understood as being goal-oriented and linked to an outcome: "bajarmoq" (to do) – arises from the experience of fulfilling a task; "bitirmoq" (to complete) – denotes the state of fully accomplishing the process of work; "tugatmoq" (to finish) – expresses the closure of the action at its highest point, meaning the complete end of the activity. In conclusion, although the sentences "Men ishni bajardim" (I did the work) – "Men ishni bitirdim" (I completed the work) – "Men ishni tugatdim" (I finished the work) differ in their structural composition, they share a common cognitive foundation. That is, human activity is inherently linked with its result, and in cognition, this connection manifests as a single unified scenario.

6. [Person + Emotional State] conceptual field. In this model, a person's inner feelings and emotions are conceptualized through various linguistic constructions. At this stage, syntactic synonyms such as "Men g'amdaman" (I am sad) and "Men ham chekyapman" (I am suffering / grieving too) are realized. These structures express the same conceptual content a person's psychological or emotional

condition but through different syntactic forms, reflecting the linguistic diversity of emotional experience.

The conceptual field [Person + his/her emotional state] represents a person's inner experiences, feelings, and psychological condition. Here, the Person (subject) – "I" is the experience of the emotion, while the emotional state expressed through the sequence "I am sad / I feel sorrow" plays a leading role. The way this state is expressed depends on various lexico-syntactic constructions, which reflect the conceptualization of inner states. In the sentence "Men g'amdaman" ("I am sad"), the speaker's emotional state is expressed directly, and the concept of "g'am" (sorrow) explicitly denotes a human emotional quality. In contrast, in "Men g'am chek¬yapman" ("I am suffering from sorrow"), metaphorical meaning transfer occurs: the expression "to suffer sorrow" metaphorically implies "to endure or carry the heaviness of grief". The criterion of synonymy between the two sentences lies in their shared core meaning the person's experience of mental suffering. However, their means of expression differ: one conveys meaning through direct nomination, the other through metaphorical expression. These sentences are connected to the conceptual source domain of physical heaviness or burden-bearing experience and to the target domain of emotional distress. In the cognitive process, the experience of "carrying a heavy load" in the physical world is associated, in human thought, with the inner state of "bearing sorrow." Thus, language represents this link metaphorically through the expression "to suffer (carry) sorrow."

In human cognition, the experiences of physical heaviness and emotional heaviness are inherently interconnected. Therefore, the concept of "g'am" ("sorrow") can be expressed both directly (as in "to be in sorrow") and metaphorically (as in "to suffer sorrow"). This phenomenon is closely related to a person's worldview and national-cultural cognition.

For instance, within Uzbek mentality, emotional suffering is often conceptualized through the verb "chekish" ("to endure," "to bear," "to be patient"), which metaphorically conveys the idea of carrying or enduring a heavy burden. Thus, while the sentences "Men g'amdaman" ("I am sad") and "Men g'am chekyapman" ("I am suffering sorrow") differ in their lexico-syntactic structures, they share a common cognitive foundation: both conceptualize the emotional state of the person through inner experience and culture-specific metaphors.

Conclusion

From the perspective of cognitive linguistics, the study of the phenomenon of synonymy allows for identifying not only the semantic but also the conceptual

foundations of linguistic units. The semantic proximity between synonyms is explained by the interconnection of conceptual domains in human cognition and their various modeling in the speech process. Therefore, in the study of cognitive synonyms, the linguist addresses not only the structure of the language but also the conceptual model of the human mind and the system of worldview.

Analysis of synonymic units in the Uzbek language shows that differences between synonymic variants are mostly related to logical, emotional, evaluative, and cultural concepts. This confirms that synonymy is closely connected not only with linguistic but also with linguocultural and psychological factors.

The results of this study indicate that the conceptual modeling of synonyms based on a cognitive approach helps to reveal their semantic structure more deeply, accurately determine meaning differentials, and reproduce classification processes of human thought in language. Thus, the modeling of cognitive synonyms is considered an important methodological direction in analyzing the interrelation between language and cognition.

ADABIYOTLAR:

1. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 256 p.

2. Langacker R. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. – 540 p.

3. Fillmore Ch.J. Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language. – Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1977. – №280. – P. 20-32.

4. Rosch E. Principles of Categorization. – In: E. Rosch & B. Lloyd (Eds.), Cognition and Categorization. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978. – P. 27–48.

5. Vierzbicka A. Semanticheskie universalii i opisanie yazykov. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury, 1999. – 287 s.

6. Apresyan Y.D. Leksicheskaya semantika: sinonimicheskie sredstva yazyka. – M.: Nauka, 1974. – 367 s.

7. Kubryakova E.S. Yazyk i znaniye: Na puti polucheniya znaniy o yazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoy tochki zreniya. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury, 2004. – 555 s.

8. Boldyrev N.N. Kognitivnaya semantika. – Tambov: Izd-vo TGU im. G.R. Derzhavina, 2011. – 220 s.

9. Popova Z.D., Sternin I.A. Kognitivnaya lingvistika. – M.: AST, 2007. – 314 s.

10. Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006. – 92 b.